THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 19 July, 1937 Number 7

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

HARRY POLLITT
The Next Stage

IVOR MONTAGU
Eden-Hitler Axis

JOHN A. MAHON
Urgent Problems

J. D. BERNAL
Psycho-Analysis

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAVLOV
and his School

by

PROFESSOR Y. P. FROLOV

Member of the All Union Institute of Experimental Medicine

A clear concise account of Pavlov's work with fascinating biographical information about the man himself

28 Illustrations *12s. 6d. net.*

KEGAN PAUL

MARX MEMORIAL LIBRARY & WORKERS' SCHOOL

SUMMER SCHOOLS
August, 1937

at GODALMING, SURREY, from July 31st to August 28th

and at SKEGNESS, LINCOLNSHIRE, from July 31st to August 14th

*

Lecturers include EMILE BURNS, T. A. JACKSON, G. R. STRAUSS, M.P., VICTOR GOLLANCZ, BEATRICE KING, J. F. HORRABIN, JOS. REEVES, J. R. CAMPBELL, W. H. WILLIAMS, WILLIAM PAUL, R. BRIDGEMAN, etc. etc.

Last week at Godalming (August 21st to 28th) reserved for Students, Teachers, Professional Workers, etc.

Inclusive charges from £2 per week. Prospectus and Syllabus of lectures from the SECRETARY, MARX HOUSE, 37a Clerkenwell Green, E.C. 1. (Telephone Clerkenwell 6639).

Prof. J. B. S. Haldane says :

"Every democrat, even if he or she is not in full agreement with the aims of Communism, should become a regular reader of the *Daily Worker*. If they do so they will get an unequalled news service from the Spanish Front"

and R. Palme Dutt

reviews international affairs in the *DAILY WORKER* every week

The DAILY WORKER is obtainable from many newsagents or by post from the

Daily Worker, Nelson Place, Cayton St., London, E.C.1. *Subscription :* Early Delivery, Weekly, 10d. ; Monthly, 3/4 ; Yearly, £2. Late Delivery : Weekly, 7d. ; Monthly, 2/4 ; Yearly, 28/-. Foreign and British Empire : 3/- monthly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labonr

VOLUME 19 JULY, 1937 NUMBER 7

Editor: R. PALME DU'TT

CONTENTS

The Communist Party Congress - - - Page 395
THE NEXT STAGE IN THE FIGHT FOR UNITY
By HARRY POLLITT

The Eden-Hitler Axis - - - - - - ,, 402
By IVOR MONTAGU

Rearmament and Overproduction - - - ,, 411
By JOHN KNIGHT

The Industrial Advance and its Urgent Problems ,, 416
By JOHN A. MAHON

The Biennial Conference of the T. and G.W.U. ,, 424
By A. F. PAPWORTH

Anglo-German Interests in Spain - - - ,, 426
By CONRAD SUDEN

Psycho-Analysis and Marxism - - - - ,, 433
By J. D. BERNAL

For Socialism in Ceylon - - - - - ,, 438

Lenin and Gorky. Letters - - - - ,, 444

Book Reviews - - - - - - - ,, 448
Our Movement Since the War - - *By* John Strachey
Palestine: The Imperialist View - *By* "British Resident"
The Novel To-day - - - - - *By* Alick West
History of the C.P.G.B.—A Statement

A Flying Start - - - - - - - ,, 455

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1937 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 2800 Bronx Park East, New York City, U.S.A.
South African Representative :—The People's Bookshop, 30 Kirk Street, Johannesburg, South Africa.
The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 49 Farringdon Road, E.C.1.
Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 5s. od.	*Volume X*	£1 10s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	£1 1s. od.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XII*	15s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIII*	15s. 6d.
Volume V	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVI*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVII*	10s. 6d.
Volume XI	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XVIII*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue except for 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST PARTY CONGRESS AND THE NEXT STAGE IN THE FIGHT FOR UNITY

By HARRY POLLITT

THE keynote of the 14th Congress of the Communist Party was the burning need for working-class unity and the necessity for developing the independence, courage and initiative of the workers to achieve this unity.

At the Congress the Party had shown itself to be united, with no differences on any of the main lines of policy before it. There was a unanimous recognition of what must be the character of the policy and activity of the Communist Party in the period immediately ahead. This can be summed up as follows :—the fight for unity ; the strengthening of the work in trade unions and factories ; the development of a mass movement that can maintain peace and liberty ; the increasing of support to the Spanish Government ; the building up of a Communist Party that, combined with other work among the masses, must conduct mass propaganda for marxism and thus build up a united and powerful Labour Movement.

At the same time as the Congress was bending all its energies to ensure that these tasks should be carried out, the dominant Labour leaders were preparing measures not aimed to help in work of this character, but containing new threats of expulsion to those within the Labour Party who, true to the real interests of the Labour Movement, are striving for unity.

Our Congress understood the meaning of these tactics and their danger to the possibility of any future advance, and we therefore adopted a policy in regard to unity which, if resolutely carried out, will help to prevent the disastrous policy of the Labour leaders being applied. We were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guided in this aim by the Congress resolution on Unity, which described the present situation as follows:

> The growth of Fascism and reaction, the Fascist war-mongers threatening, in their lust for a redivision of the globe, to engulf country after country in slaughter; and on the other side the awakening of the masses of mankind to the danger of Fascism; the development towards international working-class unity, and the coming together of the workers and of the supporters of democracy and peace in the struggle against Fascism and War; this is the picture of the world situation to-day.
>
> Wherever throughout the world Fascism has been withstood it has been through unity; unity and determination of the working class; unity of all the forces of democracy and peace. In this country only a common policy can enable the workers to go forward with united ranks to improve their immediate conditions, to preserve democracy and peace and defeat the National Government by the united action of a fighting Labour movement.

The present tactics of the Labour leaders greatly increase the responsibility of the Communist Party and active workers within the Labour Party to do their utmost to establish working-class unity in spite of all obstacles.

Having regard to the urgency of the political situation, the needs of the workers, and the grave responsibility which rests upon the British Labour Movement towards the whole international working class, the Congress steadfastly set its face against any phrase-mongering or romanticism. No toleration would have been given to any high falutin talk about "the need for shock troop tactics against Transport House," or "if certain prominent people are expelled from the Labour Party it will help the Unity Campaign," or, "perhaps if Unity were to have a few martyrs it would stimulate the imagination of the workers."

All such arguments as these would have been sternly rejected by our Congress. They have nothing in common with serious politics or policies, and actually embody the very thing that the Labour leaders themselves desire to bring about, in order to place the whole campaign for unity in a false position.

The aim of our campaign for unity is a closer unification of policy and forces; if, instead, it leads to expulsions, splits and later to complete

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defeatism, we shall have exchanged working-class politics for petty bourgeois romanticism. The exclusion of the principal Labour Party supporters of unity from their Party, and of, perhaps, a score of local branches from the Labour Party is just what Transport House is hoping will happen.

Three things were clear to Congress. First, every member of the Labour Party who desires unity must fight as never before inside the local and divisional Labour Parties. Secondly, the Communist Party itself will have to set an example of flexibility in its own campaign for unity and intensify its fight to become an affiliated organisation to the Labour Party. Thirdly, those who claim to be supporters of unity will have to abandon policies and tactics that retard the establishment of unity at home and abroad.

The successes of the Unity Campaign have compelled the Labour Party Executive to give prominence on the front page of the *Daily Herald* to a declaration that the full right to work for unity exists within the Labour Party. That declaration can now be tested in the practical work of those comrades who are leading the struggle for unity within the Labour Party. But if the declaration of the Executive Committee is a sincere one, it should be made to imply the end of heresy hunting, the withdrawal of such circulars as that issued by Arthur Woodburn, the Secretary of the Labour Party in Scotland, the end of discrimination against trade unionists for their political opinions, and loyalty to the aims which the trade union movement was founded to achieve.

The Congress charged the Central Committee of the Communist Party to avoid falling into any of the pitfalls dug by certain Labour leaders and to use its influence to prevent any exclusions from the Labour Party. For if the leading militant workers are placed outside the Labour Party, then the road is left still wider open for the dominant leaders to prepare closer co-operation with the National Government as the present situation develops.

As a result of this warning from the Congress, representatives of the Communist Party placed their views before the Unity Campaign Committee. They gave the opinion that, in future, the Unity Campaign as such should be conducted by members of the Labour Party, while the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

C.P. pledged itself to give every ounce of its support to the campaign and, at the same time, to intensify its own work for working-class unity.

The Unity demonstration at Hull has proved how correct this proposal was. Instead of Comrade Strauss being expelled from the Labour Party for speaking on the same platform as Comrade Maxton and myself, the meeting was conducted by Comrades Strauss, Cripps and Mellor. It is worth saying a word or two about this Hull meeting. It was held on June 6th. The day before, the Labour Party had deliberately organised a Conference at which Arthur Greenwood, M.P., was to put over "in a big way" the new Labour Party campaign for a million voters. Over 700 delegates were expected to attend and it was fondly hoped that it would completely overshadow the Unity meeting of the next day. But only 130 delegates were present at the official Labour conference and it was a complete fiasco—as dead as a door nail. At the Unity demonstration, on the other hand, the speakers (members of the Labour Party) got a splendid reception from the 1,500 workers present, great resentment was expressed at the policy of Transport House and a collection reached over twenty pounds. Throughout the Unity demonstration the proceedings were marked by great enthusiasm and determination to support the campaign.

We are confident that the remaining Unity demonstrations which have been organised and which will be conducted on the same lines as at Hull will prove equally successful and will strengthen the prospects of victory for unity at the October conference of the Labour Party.

The Communist Party will give its complete support to the work of the Labour Unity Committee and to *The Tribune*, the weekly paper that fights for unity. It will do all in its power to make the summer campaign a success. At the same time, we must point out that there should be greater efforts made to carry out mass work for unity within the Labour Movement. In our opinion, this means taking part in every phase of the daily struggle against capitalism, and not just relying on mass meetings. It also means the winning of the local Labour and trade union organisations—the Labour Party workers for unity should aim to surround themselves with an indestructible mass basis. The campaign must not be made to appear as if it were only the concern of a few leading personalities, but must show that it has mass backing and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support on the basis of a united struggle against the employers and the National Government.

One way of attaining this position would be a sustained effort within the local Labour Parties, trade union branches and trades councils. It must be explained why unity is so urgently needed, why the present policy of the Labour leaders must be defeated and why British Labour must fulfil the responsibilities that history has placed upon it, both towards the mass of the British people and the peoples of Europe generally. We must also do everything we can to make the official Labour campaign a success, for this can also be used to develop the drive for united action. Whether the Labour Programme for winning the next election is the one we would like or not seems to us to be beside the point. The whole machinery of the Labour Movement is going to be used to try and win a million new voters for Labour. Are we interested in this ? We think we are.

We are not just concerned in a campaign which tells people to wait until a general election and then vote Labour, but in turning it into a campaign that, by mass pressure, can help forward the mass movement to win immediate demands and can bring about the changes in the Programme that we desire. To do this, unity must be the keynote which will make it possible to awaken a new political interest and to stimulate action to win the demands of the masses now.

The Communist Party, in helping along these lines, will carry out the greatest campaign in its history for working-class unity ; it will also be winning its way towards affiliation to the Labour Party, which is more important to achieve than ever before, so that the fight for changes in policy and outlook can be effectively directed and helped forward.

Branches of the Communist Party should take every opportunity for work with the local Labour Parties. This can be done everywhere on the basis of local conditions and needs. We should try and end our tendency to take for granted that those grievances that specially interest us are of equal interest to other workers and their organisations. The united front will only be built up on the basis of what the workers want to unite and to fight upon. In every locality there is some local issue that affords the possibility of joint co-operation, and all the bells, books

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and candles in Transport House cannot prevent this from being carried out. Local wage issues ; conditions in the factories ; the fight against high rents and prices ; Means Test cases ; proposals for developing work of value in areas where unemployment is an urgent question ; aid for Spain—it is along these lines that the links between the Labour and Communist workers should be built up. This is how it was begun in France, till it finally reached a point where the French Socialist leaders were compelled to give the United Front their support. It can also be done here, but we must combine our determination with flexibility and comradely understanding of each other's point of view. The Communist Party branches must not stand aside from any type of work or of committee which gives an opportunity for explaining our aims to workers and others, and for conducting joint activity with them.

At the same time, in our propaganda and personal conversations we must stress far more than has been done up to the moment the question of rank-and-file responsibility for the policy that the Labour leaders are able to pursue. The chief responsibility undoubtedly falls upon the leaders, but there has not yet been worked out sufficiently, a planned method to change this policy. There is still too much defeatism about, too great a belief that it is hopeless to attempt to defeat the aims of the Bevins, Daltons, Citrines and Middletons.

Large sections of the rank-and-file are seriously concerned at the present position. But they do not realise yet that *they themselves have the power to bring about those changes which they say they want.*

Unity has to be fought for. Vested interests must be overcome. It is not easy. But the responsibility of the active workers for what happens in this country and its repercussions abroad must be squarely faced and understood. If this is done, then a more effective drive within the Labour Party for its transformation into a fighting united party of the working class will develop, and this transformation can so affect the entire international situation that millions will be liberated from poverty and the menace of fascism and war.

It is because the Communist Congress felt this so keenly that it devoted all its time to discussing how best it could help to bring about this great change. And this is why it appeals so strongly and so urgently to every

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

active worker inside the Labour Party to give full support now to every phase of the struggle to achieve working-class unity.

We do this for no sectional aim. We have no other interests at heart but those of the workers. The Communist Party will take no action which might play into the hands of those who wish to disrupt unity or which might lead to splits within the Labour Movement.

Our Congress gave a solemn pledge that every one of its members and organisations would give full support to every effort made within the Labour Party to win it for unity, and at the same time that it would carry forward its own struggle for unity with greater enthusiasm and determination than ever before.

The 14th Congress Resolution on Unity concludes with words which express quite clearly our aims and our confidence in our power to achieve what we believe to be the desire of the overwhelming mass of the Labour rank and file :—

> The Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain declares that along these lines of policy it will be possible to overcome all obstacles that prevent working-class unity being established in the Labour Movement. That it will lead to the workers winning their demands *now*, stemming the advance of Fascism and War, and developing alongside this a powerful mass Communist Party and an all-round strengthening of the Labour, Trade Union and Co-operative Movements.

We appeal to every reader of the LABOUR MONTHLY to help the Communist Party to fulfil this objective.

[NOTES OF THE MONTH. *Comrade Harry Pollitt's article replaces, for this issue of* THE LABOUR MONTHLY, *the usual Notes of the Month.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDEN-HITLER AXIS

By IVOR MONTAGU

THE British so-called "rearmament" programme was put over on the plea of strengthening Britain to keep its collective obligations for peace. Everybody knows the story how, in the Abyssinian dispute, Britain was so "weak," her navy so vulnerable, that, when it came to a pinch, there was not enough "peace force" in the world to give reality to a beautiful ideal, etc., etc.

The facts, for everyone who even only troubles to memorise his newspapers, are vastly different. The solid phalanx of more than sixty nations against the aggressor, the assurance of military support from every Mediterranean coast country if the British fleet were attacked, the aggressor dreading the oil sanction that would have dried up even his local war in a few weeks, his trade life-blood draining away even as it was—the near triumph, *not the failure*, of collective action, sabotaged into failure by a Foreign Office resolute to prevent at all costs any collective success that might by precedent hamstring its own future imperial liberty.

But, none the less, the fiction was to have its uses. The National Government confronted the Labour Opposition with an antithesis. You mistrust Hitler. The fascists, you say, prepare war and have no respect for treaties. The League, and the enforcement of international law will, you say, prevent war. Arms are needed to oppose Hitler, and support the League. *Ergo*, you cannot object to arms. In the presence of this tactic, the Labour Opposition was thrown into confusion. Disarmed, peace feeling made no resistance to rearmament.

Anyone who was genuinely deceived should have been present at Geneva during the latter part of May, at the first League Council meeting since the new "rearmament" programme. Britain was weak in world councils, had said the National Government. Rearmed, it would speak with a new voice. The new voice was there all right, but it was scarcely that which the simpletons had been led to expect. The young Mr. Eden, darling of the peace societies in the days before the Hoare-Laval betrayal, spoke in bullying and hectoring tones previously associated in diplomatic circles only with Fascist spokesmen blustering their way through some crisis invoked by their criminal treaty-violation.

The circumstances should be remembered. The Council was being seized by the Spanish Government with proof of violation of Spanish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

territorial integrity by the Fascist powers. Heretofore the question of foreign intervention had been kept (by the invented formula of Mr. Eden himself) on the plane of assistance given to rebels, by munitions and " volunteers," illegal in international law.

Now for the first time documents were being put forward whose authenticity was challenged by no one, least of all by Mussolini himself, and which proved without peradventure that Italy maintained upon the soil of Spain whole armies, integral units with their own commanders, ordnance, munition, Italian state services of supply, post, etc., many of them composed of conscripts, directly guided by the state organs of the chief of state himself. Further evidence was forthcoming, in case even Eden himself had dared specifically to challenge the fact any longer, demonstrating from incontrovertible documents and the testimony of the offenders themselves taken in courts of law, the presence in Spain of airmen, their planes and munitions all despatched from Germany subsequent to solemn signature of the undertaking for " non-intervention " and the withholding of " volunteers."

The first constituted a violation of the League Covenant no less definite than the invasions of Abyssinia and Manchuria ; the second displayed the inefficacy of the method of the " Non-Intervention " Committee to avert it.

Del Vayo placed the issue squarely before the Council :

> Beyond the Spanish question there is the question of the League of Nations itself. . . . . For some time the League of Nations, ignoring the enormous force of world public opinion on which it ultimately depends, has taken a road that may become fatal. Often it is more concerned with its enemies than with its friends. . . . No doubt everything should always be done to enlist the co-operation in the collective work of peace of the maximum number of States. But always on condition that the Covenant is not torn into such small pieces in pursuit of this object that we shall one day have no more flag to fly . . . .
>
> If the League is to have a future, the struggle in Spain cannot end without the League adopting a clear and firm position. This is perhaps the League's last chance to do so.

It had been in advance certain that the pressure applied by the British Government to several states would prevent any consideration of the matter by the Council and secure its reference to the Non-Intervention Committee. This was not the surprise. The surprise was Mr. Eden's manner. Alone of all delegations, the United Kingdom delegation appeared to think not even the appearances worth preserving.

Delbos and Sandler, typical of the delegations (all except the U.S.S.R. and New Zealand) squared in advance by the British pressure, at least announced their betrayal in the jargon of collective peace : " Spain quite right to raise the matter under Article 10 . . . pity to duplicate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international instruments . . . committee already in existence . . . therefore, etc." Mr. Eden alone (who could barely conceal his impatience and gazed yawning at the ceiling while Del Vayo was describing the destruction of Guernica) made not the slightest reference to anyone's rights or obligations under the Covenant or any other international agreement, referred slightingly to Del Vayo (in the eyes of the Covenant his fellow Council member) by the expression " both sides," in the accents used by the Italian delegation earlier in mentioning the Negus, and spoke of the wonderful achievements of the Non-Intervention Committee with a take-it-or-leave-it air never before heard at Geneva save from German and Italian delegates. Significant also were the British delegation's efforts in the framing of the Council resolution. The delegation attempted :

(1) To avoid all reference to the December Council resolution affirming the integrity of Spain, and the application of the Covenant in case of its violation.

(2) In regard to the forthcoming promised efforts of the States represented on the Council to secure withdrawal of combatants from Spain, to avoid any statement relating these to League obligations and to make them a matter of mere benevolent freewill.

(3) Under the heading of " withdrawal " to use the expression " of foreign nationals " in place of " foreign combatants " (the former is the Fascist delaying formulation). . . . This was too much for Delbos, who pointed out that this was not a matter of gardeners and governesses.

(4) To praise the work of the Non-Intervention Committee. . . .

This was too much for everybody, and the resolution as it stands regrets the fact that this Committee has notoriously as yet been far from successful.

One, and one impression only, was derived by all observers from the ensemble of Mr. Eden's conduct at that Council meeting. In face of its unopposed " rearmament," the new Chamberlain Government no longer thinks it necessary to maintain for home consumption the appearance of respect for Covenant obligations, or even of collaboration with those faithful to treaties as opposed to those who are contemptuous of them.

Not all the precautions of official communiques have prevented the public from gleaning the fact that the like impression has astonished the Dominions Premiers at the Imperial Conference. In the questions of repudiation of the League method and collective security, and rejection of Roosevelt's initiatives on economic as well as military disarmament, it is certain that the initiative has come from the United Kingdom and not from the Dominion statesmen, and that more than one of these is bitterly resentful at the attempts of the Foreign Office propagandists to make the Dominions into scapegoats.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Identity with the Fascist standpoint in respect to method in international relations is also brightly illuminated in the short history of the proceedings of the Non-Intervention Committee. This British-invented body is smaller than the League. None the less, it includes 27 States. On the following issues Britain, Germany, Italy and Portugal have been united, and isolated, against the views of all other States' members of the various committees and sub-committees dealing with them :

1. " Control."

   (*a*) That air control should be postponed indefinitely ;

   (*b*) That control of the rebels in the Canary Islands should be postponed indefinitely ;

   (*c*) That if the Soviet Union participated in control, it should be assigned a zone in the extreme Atlantic ;

   (*d*) That to the Fascist fleets should be assigned the coasts of Government Spain, against which they had already been accused of acts of aggression, and that the control fleets should not consist of mixed units ;

   (*e*) That the control fleets should not carry neutral observers.

2. " Volunteers."

   (*a*) That their withdrawal should not be considered unless the Committee also considered immobilising the gold of the Spanish Government, and this while at the same time refusing to consider also immobilising the capital resources of the rebels, such as products of mines seized and exported by them ;

   (*b*) That the withdrawal of combatants alone should not be considered, its immense complication by the Fascist thesis of " agitators " would be accepted.

3. Various.

   (*a*) That the appeal to Franco to abstain from bombing and machine-gunning open towns should be whittled down to a vague humanitarian appeal to both sides, not specifically appealing against a repetition of Guernica ;

   (*b*) That no action should be taken, despite the " control " scheme, to protect shipping, of which nearly one hundred vessels, principally belonging to the Soviet Union and the Scandinavian countries, but some to Great Britain, have been delayed, sometimes sunk or seized, stripped of their cargoes, by Franco's vessels, and none by the fleets of the Spanish Government.

On all these questions, Germany, Italy and Portugal have taken a single view. On all these questions the United Kingdom, *and no other country*,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has supported that view. The Almeria incident is another milestone. The steps may be counted, away from the League and down the path named (monstrously) realism :

(1) The repudiation in turn by Germany and Italy of obligations under the Covenant, or indeed of the authority of any international instrument as constituting obligations not susceptible of repudiation by unilateral denunciation. (Rhineland and Abyssinia.) (2) On the plea of realism, negotiation with Germany and Italy on the Non-Intervention Committee, on a plane where action is not bounded by international instruments. (Non-Intervention Committee.) (3) The repudiation by Germany and Italy of the principle of negotiation as a precedent even to unlimited unilateral decision. (Almeria.) (4) Association with Germany and Italy in endorsing the principle of common action against an accused without provision for the possible rebuttal of the accusation by the accused even to be heard. (Four-Fleet Control Pact.)

Collaboration with the Fascist powers is sometimes defended by British spokesmen in the Houses of Parliament as a " realist " means of peace. The National Government collaboration has not been of this character. It has invariably taken the form of an endorsement and association with a Fascist policy antagonistic to peaceful instruments. The British agreement with Italy in January of this year provided for the use of British Somaliland ports for " the speedier development of Abyssinia " ; it allowed their use for importation of arms which were correspondingly forbidden to be imported through British territory to the defending Abyssinian armies, then still in the field and supported by an Assembly resolution of more than 60 nations, including the United Kingdom. The use of the ports is more complete than any use ever accorded to the Emperor of Abyssinia. It was presumed at the time that compensating advantages were expected by the British Government from Italy, and their character was generally supposed to be a detachment of Italy from Germany. Whatever the expectation, the result of the agreement has not been in any degree an approximation of Italy to the obligations of the Covenant and international law.

* * * * *

To-day the British Government is on the eve of an agreement with Germany, Mr. Eden admitted as much in an unguarded conversation in Geneva. At its pressing instance, Von Neurath, for whom there was not even Blomberg's excuse of the Coronation, agreed to visit London. Precautions, unprecedented in the long history of Foreign Office pressure on the editorial offices of Fleet Street, were taken at the time of the Almeria bombardment to stifle the public reaction and to prevent any comment unsympathetic to Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The object of the agreement, doomed to as little realisation as that of January with Mussolini, is now the opposite of the former effort—it is the detachment of Germany from Italy.

It is worth while to glance at the lines of this proposed agreement, as forecast in the *Daily Telegraph* four days, and in the *Observer* three days, before Neurath was due in London.

The *Daily Telegraph* refers to the " reforms of the League Germany considers necessary," and the proposal for a Western pact.

> When talk of a general European settlement was opened early in 1935, Britain and France insisted that no Western agreement could be concluded unless Germany concluded a security agreement in the East of Europe. . . . To-day it seems unlikely that this aspect of the problem will be regarded as urgent.

On the other hand, says the *Telegraph :*

> Attention will be concentrated on Czechoslovakia. Can Baron von Neurath give assurances that all ideas for the forcible readjustment of frontiers in that part of Europe have now been abandoned ?

It answers the question by saying that he will, but

> " not until a greater measure of autonomy has been granted to the German minorities in Bohemia."

The *Observer* is still more precise : " The full benefit of the Anglo-German talks can be felt only if they lead to four-power talks," and its Berlin correspondent remarks : " Germany intends to make a tremendous effort to elbow Soviet Russia out of European affairs entirely." In significant phrases, also, the *Daily Telegraph* observes : " The colonial issue will probably not be raised by Baron von Neurath," and the *Observer :* " It is certain that Baron von Neurath's brief will not include any claim for colonies."

At the League Council Meeting in Geneva at the end of May, Mr. Eden already betrayed a hint of his intention. In reporting to the League the new Anglo-French understanding with Belgium, Delbos formulated his hope that it would lead to a Western agreement : " The French Government at no time forgets the connection that exists between Western security and the security of Europe in general," while Eden's hope was for " the establishment of a closer collaboration between all the interested countries." " All the interested countries "—the countries interested in Belgium, this is not " Europe in general." A live Parliamentary Opposition would instantly have demanded explanation from Eden at this time.

For what is the precipice to which the National Government has now led, blindfolded, its democracy ? At the time of the last public negotiations with Germany, Hitler stated his position :

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Refusal to accept the obligations and mutual guarantees of integrity implicit in the League Covenant.

Refusal to undertake not to make war in the East.

Refusal to undertake not to dismember Czechoslovakia in the South.

Refusal of any form of guaranteed limitation of armaments.

Replacement of League diplomacy, open to all, by Stresa diplomacy, excluding the Soviet Union.

The British public did not appear to regard this as a basis of negotiation promising to peace. The National Government was obliged therefore to change its tactics:

> It is felt in London that the method of public announcement when applied to foreign policy has exhausted its usefulness. If any agreement can be reached with Germany it will be as the result of long and careful preparation in private. (*Morning Post*, February 2.)

The result of these secret negotiations now presents itself to us. Britain rearmed, strong for peace and the League, negotiates an agreement based on:—Modification of the League Covenant, Article 16 (Guarantees Article), and its separation from the Versailles Treaty (which defines the frontiers of the Central European states), the announced Empire policy following the Imperial Conference. A pact exclusive to the Western nations with no pact in the East. An "autonomy" for the Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia, which will mean the Berlin-subsidised Nazis terrorising the rest of Bohemia, and ultimate dismemberment. More than likely a loan from the City of London thrown in, to strengthen the economic position of Germany, weakness in which would largely make her arms useless. Four-Power consultations in being, extracted out of the Non-Intervention Committee despite French reluctance, and by a trick put over by the British Foreign Office, which, as the Soviet representative, Maisky, revealed, had not scrupled to lie about the proceedings of the full Committee in order to gain these consultations. And perhaps a renunciation of Germany's colonial claims, which have never been in the least sincere (Hitler pooh-poohs them in *Mein Kampf*)—the old colonies were never made use of by Germany either as sources of raw materials or as outlets for population—and as like as not have been advanced in collusion with the British Foreign Office. The "long and careful preparation" reveals itself as preparation only for putting over on the British public what it would scarcely have tolerated four short months ago.

These are precisely the terms which could have been negotiated any time in the past. For the British Foreign Office has wanted this agreement just as long and just as unchangedly as the German. Why then has it not been reached before?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The *Daily Telegraph* declares that " two factors " are believed to have now " influenced " German policy : " Britain's rearmament programme," and " The unity of the British Empire, as revealed at the Coronation and the Imperial Conference."

These are the two factors. What they have influenced, however, is not " German policy," but the National Government's confidence.

With the rearmament programme it feels strong enough to discard the League, except as a pulpit for sermons, and take its place as a rival and colleague on a plane with the Fascist powers, unbound by any awkward Covenant rules, and relying on its sole strength to manœuvre with or against them. The Imperial Conference has reassured it that the Dominions are still so economically tied they dare not protest at any humiliation, and the Coronation has persuaded it that the Labour Party will offer no effective opposition.

To sum up : Rearmed Britain shows the League-faithful British Government as contemptuous of League obligations as Fascist powers ; acquiescing in their aggression upon Spain by land, sea and air and presenting them with the authority to impose a blockade ; yielding Nazi Germany a free hand in the East, advancing Nazi plans of dismemberment in the centre, and participating in Four-Power conversations that hold France in manacles.

This is the one policy that the National Government can adopt, for its paramount class necessity, to avert at all costs the overthrow of Hitler or Mussolini, obliges it to endorse every action they choose, at the same time rearming to keep pace with their thus augmented authority.

It is a policy which makes war inevitable.

As we write, Hitler has just contemptuously called off the Neurath visit and, with Mussolini, shows every sign of immediately using the Four-Power Naval Agreement as sanction for open war in an effort to finish off Spain. The clause of consent in advance (after consultation) to any measure Hitler cared to undertake made such a development certain the moment Eden signed it, without a protest at Almeria. Just as Almeria itself was certain, and followed likewise within a few hours, when Eden prevented the League Council from taking notice of the presence in Spain of the Fascist armies.

At the moment, the National Government press is playing up a " disappointment " with Hitler for this action. This is mere bluff. It is not even a lovers' quarrel. Their determination to reach an accommodation will make them swallow this snub, as they swallowed that in 1935, when Hitler pretended to have a cold, put off Simon and announced rearmament, but Simon paid his visit none the less.

The leading article in the *Times* of June 23 is from first to last a plea to Germany still, even now, not to " put demands to Britain and France

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such as, in reason alone, they cannot meet" (*i.e.*, such as the British Government would gladly accept, but dare not for fear of rousing an outburst of public indignation). It reminds Germany that "Mr. Chamberlain's Government had the country unitedly behind them in their latest invitation to Germany; and warns them that the chance may never be so good again (*i.e.*, Labour may realise on what terms that invitation was issued).

In such circumstances the Fascist powers will multiply the bloodiness of their aggression. Their hand is such that they cannot overcall it. Neurath can come when he likes, for Chamberlain will be ever-ready. But will Labour still be "unitedly behind him?"

Uncompromising opposition, the overthrow of the National Government, a check by collective action to the Fascist powers, preserves peace surely, because neither alone nor together are they yet strong enough to face a major war, and a check to their prestige will overthrow them by encouraging internal opposition (the reason why the National Government will in no circumstances check them).

The sole difference, in relation to collective peace, between the armament of Hitler and Mussolini and that of Chamberlain is that Chamberlain, having an "opposition" to appease, pays lip-service to collective peace. It makes no difference to his acts.

In Germany, after the Reichstag fire and terror elections had produced a majority (though not an absolute majority) for Hitler, the rump of the Social Democratic Party stood on a dais in the limelight in the Potsdam Garrison Church and voted with the Nazi Party on a resolution about Versailles. History already despises this hideous unity, blind to all but the surface value of the words and the formality of parliament.

The British Labour Opposition, which acquiesces in the word Non-Intervention, when the reality is a National Government blockade of Spain facilitating the unimpeded intervention of the Fascist powers; which acquiesces in the word negotiation, when the reality is secret conspiracy with the Fascist powers to abet their refusal to negotiate with the selected victim; which acquiesces in rearmament, when the reality is to make the National Government strong enough to dismiss the League—identifies itself with the rump of Social Democracy. Its weakness alone has enabled the "long and careful preparation" for putting across Neurath's visit to remain secret and to achieve success.

By its actions the National Government shows itself a danger to peace no whit less than Mussolini and Hitler, its closest allies in world politics. If we are ready to combat Mussolini and Hitler at every opportunity, then we must be equally ready to deny arms to the National Government and to develop an unflagging, effective and militant opposition to its every move.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REARMAMENT AND OVERPRODUCTION

By JOHN KNIGHT

After dealing with the "Financial Consequences of Rearmament" in the June issue of the "Labour Monthly" and showing the meaning of rearmament in terms of prices and wages, John Knight turns this month to another economic aspect of the Arms Plan.

ABOUT every eight to ten years the capitalist system is violently shaken by an overproduction crisis. The producers of means of production produce too much in relation to the purchasing power of those who need machines, factory buildings, etc.; and the producers of consumers' goods produce too much in relation to the purchasing power of the consumers. There is no definite rule according to which the crisis must break out first on the market of producers' goods or first on the market of consumers' goods. But on whichever market it starts to break out, the crisis spreads over capitalist society as a whole.

Among the goods produced to-day in Britain one kind plays an increasingly greater rôle from week to week. This kind of goods is neither sold on the market where producers' goods are offered, nor on the market where consumers' goods are awaiting purchasers. If we look around for a third market on which these goods might be offered or sold, we find none.

These mysterious goods are the products of the armament industry. With extremely few exceptions armaments, battleships and tanks, aerodromes and heavy artillery, are not produced for a market in which they may or may not find a buyer. Usually armaments are produced only after they have found a buyer.

The buyer of armaments is the State. The State orders armaments and the armament industry produces these armaments according to the orders received. There is no stop for armament products between their leaving the factory and their reaching a possible purchaser. They are purchased already before they are produced.

Now, if armament makers produce only so much as the State orders, and if armaments account for an increasing percentage of the total of the commodities produced, an ever growing part of the national production seems to be safe against overproduction.

For is it not the case that armaments are produced only to the extent demanded by the State? And is it not the case that the State has never

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet refused to take all the armaments ordered? How, then, can there be overproduction? And if there is less and less overproduction, is not the danger of a new economic crisis growing smaller and smaller? Are not large armament orders a splendid means of lessening the danger of a crisis brought about by overproduction? Are not armament orders the foundation of a planned economy? Is not every armament order planned in so far as its execution is obviously desired by the State because otherwise the State would not have given the order? Furthermore is it not planned in so far as its acceptance by the buyer is assured, since the State has never yet refused to pay for an order of armaments?

Undoubtedly, all this seems to be the case, and as far as armaments are concerned we have the phenomenon, unusual in capitalist society, of supply and demand seemingly being in equilibrium, and therefore excluding the possibility of an overproduction crisis.

Are we not justified, therefore, in drawing the conclusion that the greater the part played by armament manufacturers in the nation's business the smaller the danger of depression and crisis because of overproduction?

No! and again No! The danger is just as great or rather greater. The danger consists just in those facts which seem to preclude it.

The most serious danger arises just from the fact that there can be no overproduction because the State would always buy what it has ordered. The danger of overproduction is all the greater just because the future purchaser of armaments would never let down the armament manufacturers and would always take their goods. But how can this be? How can the danger of overproduction be greater because of the fact that there never would be overproduction because the State would always buy the armaments ordered? What contradictory nonsense that seems to be, at first sight!

How does overproduction express itself usually? In this way: the growing production finds relatively fewer and fewer purchasers. It is true that the purchasing power of the buyers is usually increasing too, but it does not increase so fast as the value of new production, which increases in volume and price. Stocks of unsold commodities begin to accumulate, and the producers are faced with the necessity of slowing down production and lowering prices. The boom has ended, and depression and crisis begin.

Overproduction of armaments does not occur in this way. There are no stocks which increase because of a relative decline of the purchasing power of the buyer of armaments. The State takes the armaments off the hands of the producers as soon as they are ready to be delivered.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But how does the State manage always to have enough purchasing power? How does the State pay for armaments? Obviously out of revenue. The revenue of the State consists of taxes, customs receipts, etc., and of loans.

Taxes, customs receipts, etc., are paid chiefly by the masses of the people. *In so far as the State pays increasing armament orders out of increasing taxes, customs receipts, etc., it pays through increasing confiscation of mass purchasing power. The higher the taxes, etc., the greater usually the confiscation of mass purchasing power, and the greater the danger of overproduction of all those commodities which the masses of the people buy.*

Increased armaments, therefore, undoubtedly mean greater danger of overproduction of consumers' goods bought by the masses of the people, and of those producers' goods, such as textile machinery, etc., which are bought by the producers of consumers' goods.

One might argue perhaps: why is there no overproduction of consumers' goods in Germany, where the share of armament production has increased more than in any other country and where taxes affecting the mass of the people have risen more than anywhere else. The explanation is a simple one. On the one hand the Nazis have brutally kept down wages to the level they reached at the peak of the crisis in 1932, or have even lowered them. On the other hand the Nazis have diverted most imported raw materials from the consumers' goods industries to the armament industry, so that the consumers' goods industries can not increase their production to any considerable degree. In Germany, therefore, there is no overproduction of consumers' goods because the whole consumers' goods industry is suppressed continuously and is already, as it has been for some years, in a state of permanent depression. In the consumers' goods industry in Germany there is little danger of a crisis of overproduction because there is already a continuous crisis due to lack of production facilities: there is lack of raw materials, and there is a partial lack of man-power because the workers are needed for armament purposes.

But the increasing danger of overproduction in the consumers' goods industries is only part of the economic danger of increased armaments. Other and much more serious dangers are connected with the fact that not all armament orders are paid out of increased taxes, customs receipts, etc. Part of the armaments are paid out of extraordinary revenue accruing from loans.

Ordering armaments and paying for them with loans means that the State wants to buy more than its purchasing power permits. Loans are nothing else than borrowed purchasing power. This borrowing of purchasing power may either be planned from the very beginning, or it may

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happen that the ordinary revenue of the State was smaller than was expected, and in order to pay for the armaments ordered the State has unexpectedly to borrow purchasing power in form of loans.

The temporary acquisition of purchasing power by loans shows clearly that the equilibrium between production and purchasing power in the armament economy is an artificial one. It does not really exist. The purchasing power of the State is not really as strong as its armament orders seem to indicate. The fact that actual overproduction of armaments occurs is obscured by the State's facilities for borrowing enough purchasing power to buy up the overproduced quantities of armaments also.

If therefore the British Government plans to order about fifteen million pounds worth of armaments and explains that it needs to borrow about £400 million in order to be able to buy those armaments, it is confessing that it artificially creates overproduction of armaments, that it orders more armaments than it can pay for out of its own resources.

Owing to the peculiar character of armament economy, the dangers of overproduction lie not on the production side but on the purchasing side. Overproduction will not appear through increasing stocks, but through increased borrowing of purchasing power. In order to see signs of overproduction we have to watch not the armament factories, but the Government purse.

What are the dangers of armament overproduction, and how do they affect us ? It is usually explained by bourgeois economists that it makes a great difference whether a State borrows money on the open market or simply prints the money which it needs in order to pay the armament industry. In the one case, it is true, there will be an increasing debt burden and more taxes will have to be paid in order to pay the interest on the increased debt. In the other case, however, there will be inflation, affecting everybody severely. Getting money through loans is a sign of sound State finances, showing that the State is trusted by the banks, the rentiers, and the people. Getting money by printing new money is a sign that the State is distrusted and therefore has to resort to fraudulent tricks.

Nothing, however, is further from the truth. It is true that not all loans are a sign of an unhealthy financial state, for the purposes for which the loan is issued may be of a nature easily allowing the repayment of the loan after a time, as for instance in the case of the erection of an electric power station. But this does not hold good for loans which are to pay for armaments. Large loans for armament purposes can be successfully issued by the State only after the money market has been prepared by fraudulent, by inflationary means. While the printing of new money in order to pay for armaments must lead to inflation, large armament loans

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are often prepared by starting a credit inflation before their issue. In order to keep the interest rate down, in order to keep the market well provided with money, the central bank and similar State institutions follow a policy of easy and cheap credits, flooding the market with money created on the basis of doubtful bills. The difference between an inflation as it occurred, for instance, in Germany during the last war years and the first post-war years, and the credit inflation slowly coming about in Britain to-day is only a technical and not a qualitative difference. Whilst in Germany the State printed bills (Treasury bills) and got for them all the money it needed from the Reich money-printing establishments, in Britain more and more money is lent to financiers on the basis of commercial or personal bills, increasing numbers of which are of doubtful character—money printed to the order of the Bank of England, and then partly utilised by finance capital for subscriptions to Government loans.

Inflation in England is still, of course, in its initial stage. It has not yet progressed very far. But the Government's armaments purchases have not progressed very far yet as compared with their ultimately planned purchases.

Instead of an overproduction of armament commodities we have, therefore, an overproduction of money for armament purchases. And the dangers of an overproduction of money are even greater than those of an overproduction of commodities. Overproduction of money—inflation—is the best means available for finance capital rapidly to increase the exploitation of the workers, the expropriation of small capital, of the small bourgeoisie, of the mass of small investors.

Inflation is by far the best means of cheating not only the workers, but all other groups of capitalist society who are not financially very strong. *Inflation is the best means of hitting at the same time, and by the same means all those groups within capitalist society who form the natural backbone of a People's Front.*

The enormous armament programme of the Government, therefore not only does not diminish the dangers of depression and crisis, but increases them immensely, leading straight to a severe crisis in the consumers' producing industries, either through overproduction of consumption goods or through artificial and brutal suppression of these industries (as is the case in Germany), and leading furthermore to a general inflation, the initial stages of which we can now already observe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INDUSTRIAL ADVANCE AND ITS URGENT PROBLEMS

By JOHN A. MAHON

THE first five months of 1937 witnessed a series of industrial actions, including strikes, in which the working class showed its increasing spirit of revolt against the low wages and bad conditions resulting from nine years of official Mondism. An examination of the experiences of this five months is urgently necessary in order that the subsequent development of the industrial advance of the working class may be accelerated, and combined with political awakening in order to hasten the realisation of a working-class united front against the National Government.

The most important strikes which have taken place in this period are :

IN THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRY.

Clydeside Apprentices. Engineering employers have always refused to negotiate with the trade unions on apprentices' conditions. On March 31 apprentices on the Clyde, to the number of 13,000, struck against the refusal of the employers to consider the Apprentices' Charter of demands, including a standard rate of wages, an increase each year, a ratio of apprentices to journeymen, and trade union rights. The engineering unions of the Clyde called a one-day protest strike in support of the lads, 100,000 workers ceased work. A ban on overtime was imposed. The employers gave the unions the assurance that if the lads returned to work they would be prepared to negotiate. The lads returned on May 5th.

Parkhead Forge, Glasgow. 2,200 men, mainly A.E.U., struck unofficially at the end of March for higher wages. The firm, Messrs. Beardmore, joined the Employers' Federation after the men had put in their claim. After some delay the A.E.U. Executive took a ballot and gave official recognition, including strike pay. Two weeks later it advised the men to return, on the understanding that negotiations would take place. The men returned.

Oxford Pressed Steel workers, members of T. and G.W.U., stopped the plant for four days in April while they enrolled every man, woman, girl and boy into the Union. Wage concessions followed the return to work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN MINING.

The drive against company unionism was lifted to a national issue by the fight at Harworth, Notts. After a six months stoppage there, the M.F.G.B. took a national ballot and threatened a national stoppage. Company unionism was then liquidated on the basis of the absorption of the Spencer Union into the M.F.G.B. with certain two-year concessions of position to the Spencer officials.

Company unionism at Bedwas, South Wales, was also liquidated by the resolute action of the South Wales Miners' Federation.

IN ROAD PASSENGER TRANSPORT.

Scottish Busmen. 9,000 men organised in the T. and G.W.U. struck on March 9th against the refusal of the combine to consider their demands, including flat rate of 1s. 5d. per hour for drivers, 1s. 3½d. for conductors, and 11d. for junior conductors. While the Scottish conference of the T. and G.W.U. supported the strike and 6,000 Glasgow Corporation busmen levied themselves 2s. 6d. per week, the T. and G.W.U. Executive refused support or recognition. After ten days the men returned on a pledge of no victimisation and the immediate opening of negotiations. Mr. Clay, of T. and G.W.U. headquarters, was present at the meeting which decided to return and stated that the Union would see that the pledges were carried out.

English Counties Busmen. After a number of county disputes, a strike began on April 14 in Kent which by May 1st had spread to ten counties and involved 10,000 men members of T. and G.W.U. The workers' demands included negotiations for a national agreement, 2d. per hour increase, revision of schedules, extra pay for Sundays and overtime. The T. and G.W.U. Executive gave no support. On May 5 a conference was held at Transport House where the men agreed to return on basis of no victimisation and opening of national negotiations, guaranteed by the Union E.C.

Central London Busmen.—From May 1 to May 28, 25,000 men were in official strike action for the 7½-hour day. The T. and G.W.U. Executive officially recognised the bus strike and officially isolated it by ordering trams and trolley-buses to continue work. The E.C. accepted the report of the Court of Enquiry, which merely stated that there was a *prima facie* case for an enquiry into the effects of speed on the men's health. On this basis the E.C. withdrew power from the Central Bus Committee, and ordered the men to return to work. It followed this by suspending the democratic machinery of the Bus Section and arbitrarily signing a new agreement with the Board without the men or their representatives knowing what was in it. This new agreement ruled out

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the 7½ hours, consolidated some already existing improvements won by the Central Bus Committee on the 1932 agreement, and worsened the men's position in several important respects.

* * * * *

In addition are to be noted important results from pressure of the workers without actual strike action.

The craftsmen in the *Port of London ship repair industry*, after ten months ban on all overtime, secured a new agreement with a 10s. 6d. per week increase of wages and an hour off the working week, double time for all overtime, and numerous smaller improvements.

The *Barking Power* station staff by the threat of an embargo on overtime and a ballot for strike action secured a substantial wage increase and 100 per cent. trade unionism for the first time since the general strike.

The *cable workers* in South East London, led by the shop stewards committee of Siemens, after a campaign of public agitation and parliamentary lobbying, secured an annual paid holiday of one week from the cable employers' association.

In March the *South Wales Miners' Federation* secured a new coalfield agreement with wage increases for 100,000 men, varying from 2s. 6d. to 10s. per week.

In June the *National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers* concluded an agreement covering 250,000 workers in the men's wholesale clothing trades giving 1d. an hour increase on the basic rate to men and ½d. to women.

In June the *Printing and Kindred Trades Federation* was offered a working week of 45 hours, with no reductions, in response to its claim for 40 hours. The present week is 48 hours.

What emerges from this round of collisions between sections of the working class and the employers ?

We shall see more clearly if we set out the results in the form of a table showing the distinction between those actions led by the workers themselves through their shop stewards and branches, and those controlled by the Executives.

Actions led by shop stewards, trade union branches and District Committees, without Executive sanction.	*Results.*
Clydeside apprentices' strike.	Employers agree to negotiate.
Scottish busmen strike.	Employers agree to negotiate. Considerable concessions since.
English Counties busmen strike.	Employers agree to negotiate. Considerable concessions since.
Pressed steel strike.	100 per cent. trade union organisation and wage concessions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Port of London ship repair embargo on overtime.	10s. 6d. per week increase, one hour off working week.
South-East London Cable Workers' agitation.	One week's annual holiday with pay.
Barking Power Station embargo on overtime.	Considerable wage concesions. 100 per cent. trade union.
Actions led by Executives	
Parkhead Forge strike taken over by A.E.U., E.C.	Employers agree to negotiate. No concessions to time of writing.
South Wales new coalfield agreement.	Wage increases from 2s. 6d. to 10s. per week.
South Wales and Notts. coalfields drive against company unionism.	Company unionism liquidated.
Tailors' new agreement.	1d. per hour for men. ½d. per hour for women.
Printing trade hours.	45 instead of present 48, claim being 40.
London bus strike.	New agreement ruling out 7½ hours and actually worsening men's position in some respects.

The first thing that emerges from this record is that the employers are making concessions whenever they are confronted with a determined and united drive of the workers. Particularly in the industries where the employers are reaping a golden harvest from the government rearmament plan, they will sooner pay up than face an interruption of production. The coalowners have schemed for years to establish company unionism, the miners have now swept it away. In ship repair and cable the concessions are extensive.

The second thing is that the employers are relying upon the Right wing trade union leaders to protect them from the workers. Where the Right is dominant, as in the T. and G.W.U. Executive led by Ernest Bevin, the union machine is used to defend the employers, and the workers' position is worsened. Where the Left is in control, as in the S.W.M.F., the union machine is used to express the workers' demands with success as a result. The preference of the workers for official action is clear by the fact that numbers of branches and District Committees have endorsed many of the "unofficial" actions which the Executives have refused to recognise. The outbreak of "unofficial" strikes is the direct consequence of Right wing misuse of the official machinery in the interests of the employers.

It is a most lamentable fact, and one which is a warning to the whole trade union movement, that the most activity, solidarity and public support, and the biggest gains, developed precisely in those cases where the dominant group in the General Council had least influence, and that a veritable blight descended where they controlled. Compare the solidarity in the unrecognised strikes of the Scottish busmen, where

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Glasgow men levied themselves 2s. 6d. per week, and in the Clyde apprentices' strike, where 100,000 stopped work in a one-day solidarity strike, or in the London ship repair strike, where members of half-a-dozen unions stood shoulder to shoulder for ten months, with the isolation of the recognised London bus strike, where one trade union section did the work of strikers in the same union! To such a pass is Transport House leadership reducing the trade unions.

If the employers are relying upon the Right wing trade union leaders, the latter are certainly making a determined effort to justify their masters' reliance. If only they would show in the fight against capital one-tenth of the energy they use in fighting the rank and file, the trade union movement would undergo a remarkable invigoration. They do not shrink at the disruption of the union ranks in their fanatical loyalty to the employers. The Executive of the E.T.U. has expelled the London District Committee, the A.E.U. Executive threatens the shop stewards and expels the president of the London District Committee, the T. and G.W.U. Executive orders an enquiry into the conduct of the London busmen's leaders, in terms which reveal their desire for the expulsion of the men who have the busmen's confidence, whilst a new press barrage of accusations and threats is launched against Communists, by which is meant anyone who refuses to agree to the Executive policy of suiciding trade union principles.

To show the depth of degradation to which Right wing leadership has sunk and the complete bankruptcy of their position in terms of trade unionism, let us examine the arguments which Mr. Bevin has circulated to the London bus and tram men in an attempt to justify his policy.

He thus explains the reasons for ordering the tramway men to carry the busmen's passengers :—

(*a*) Calling out the tramwaymen would not contribute one iota to the winning of the maximum 7½-hour day.

(*b*) It would not shorten the dispute.

(*c*) It would complicate the situation.

(*d*) Instead of assisting the busmen to obtain a proper settlement, it would weaken their position.

If the tram and trolleybusmen had been ordered to strike and had broken their agreement, the fight would then have turned upon broken agreements instead of the issues involved and would have become very largely a political struggle.*

If these arguments could hold water, they would prove that there is no need for the existence of the Transport and General Workers' Union. For what they mean is :—

*Statement circulated by T. and G.W.U. Executive to all members of London Bus Section.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. Any body of trade unionists working under a collective agreement is thereby prohibited from ceasing work when asked to do the work of another body of trade unionists who are on strike.

When and where has this absurdity ever received trade union sanction, either in theory or in practice? On the contrary, it is an elementary principle of trade unionism that any work normally done by men on strike is *black*. Trade union principle demands that no trade unionist touch it.

2. That if a body of men are on strike, and a second body of trade unionists, to whom the work normally done by the strikers has been transferred by the employers, refuse to do it and cease work, they are weakening the position of the strikers.

No wonder the Union Executive does not try to prove this ridiculous argument; it would certainly have a hard job to carry any conviction to trade unionists or to any one else in possession of their normal faculties.

3. That the employers have the right to impose entirely new conditions, without breaking the agreement, but if the workers refuse to work under these new conditions they are breaking the agreement. The issue then becomes not the conditions, but the principle of the sanctity of agreements.

Is it not obvious to everyone that the tremendous overloading of the trams during the bus dispute constituted a new factor entirely unforeseen in the agreement—something which would never have been agreed to by the men? And if the tram men struck against such overloading, are they then breaking the agreement? On the contrary, it is an action to prevent the agreement being broken.

Let us put the argument in terms of an ordinary factory. One floor is out on dispute. The floor above gets, in addition to its own work, the greater part of the work of the floor in dispute. When the workers protest they are told that should they stop work they would not be helping the floor below, but they would be breaking the sanctity of trade union agreements! Apparently the sanctity of trade union agreements, therefore, means that the employer has the right to double your work, provided that there is a strike of other workers. If he doubled your work without such a strike that would of course be a breach of the agreement. But because it is work normally done by men now on strike, it is the workers who break the agreement if they don't do the work.

Such is the logic of Transport House.

Finally must be noted the coma of the General Council and the National Executive of the Labour Party. The General Council, forgetful alike of standing orders, Congress decisions and simple common sense, does

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not lift a finger to co-ordinate the wages movement or the struggle for shorter hours. It allows sectionalism to continue unchallenged, at a moment when vigorous unity of action could double the membership of the trade unions. The Labour Party E.C., stirred from its silence by the drive of the Unity Campaign, produces an Immediate Programme which turns out to be a programme for delaying immediate demands until we have a Labour Government. Could there be any better situation for preparing a smashing Labour victory at the next election than a strike situation? Was not the London bus strike the very place and time to popularise the idea of socialisation of transport? But the whole political wing of the Labour movement stands entirely aloof from the industrial struggles, non-intervention has apparently been so profitable in Spain that they now want to extend it to Glasgow, Harworth and London. Even the fall in the Labour vote in by-election after by-election does not appear to alarm them. Truly, there are none so blind as those who do not wish to see.

What is necessary to press forward the industrial advance and develop in Britain a mass movement comparable in magnitude and political consequences with the French stay-in strikes and the American Committee for Industrial Organisation?

First, the popularisation in every paper and from every platform of the idea that the trade unions' opportunity is here and now. The armaments plan and the accompanying shortage of labour will not last for ever. The iron must be struck while it is hot.

Second, the thoughtful preparation of the presentation of the workers' claims, backed up by demonstrations of united determination. The victories of the London ship repair men, the cable workers, South Wales miners, deserve to be made widely known. The strike is not the only way to fight and unprepared strikes are not the best strikes. There is room for a widespread discussion in the branches and on the jobs of the best forms of strike preparation and the building up of a mighty shop stewards' organisation and press, remembering that "the real fruits of strikes are the increased unity of the workers."

Third, the most determined effort to maintain and extend trade union democracy and the control of the machine in accordance with the wishes of the members. This can be done by a combination of solidarity on the job and ceaseless contest for every position and in every discussion within the unions. There must be no illusions that the present Right wing leaders will fight the employers, they may put themselves at the head of movements, but not for the purpose of fighting the employers.

Fourth, realisation that the advancing cost of living is wiping out the niggardly concessions that have been given and rendering essential a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

complete revision of all the existing collective agreements, which must be brought into line with the present-day conditions of work and life and in the factories.

Fifth, to overcome the gap between industrial and political activity, and to combine all the resources of the working class and its organisations in a campaign to arouse both industrial and political action for wage increases, the 40-hour week, holidays with pay, and pensions at 60. In numerous localities unity in action could be established now in a drive to organise the unorganised factories around these demands, combined with the political demand for the necessary legislation by the National Government. The campaign for the Labour Party's Immediate Programme can be turned into a real revival of the socialist spirit if its demands are presented to the workers as things upon which immediate action can be taken.

The threatening political dangers menacing the workers on all sides are calling aloud for working-class unity. Growing circles of the Labour Movement realise that the choice is literally "unity or death." But unity must be built, be organised, be brought into living existence, and it will be done quickest by united action around those industrial demands which hold the immediate attention of millions of workers, demands which they are prepared to fight for, during the struggle for which political consciousness can be awakened and political unity achieved.

Has Your Party a Local Paper?
if not, get into touch with
THE WORKERS' MONTHLY ●
which offers a remarkably cheap service to Labour Parties, **through its Localised Editions**

FOUNDED 1926—Going Stronger than Ever

Frankly Challenging

Specimen copy 1½d. Postal subscription, 12 months, 1/6

Manager, "W.M." "Brixham," The Mount, Guildford, Surrey

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF THE T. & G.W.U.

By A. F. PAPWORTH

THE Biennial Conference of our Union takes place this year at Torquay, from the 5th to the 9th July. It will be an outstanding Conference in the history of this Union—about 350 delegates attending, and some 600 resolutions to be discussed.

The importance of this Conference to the Labour movement is more outstanding this year by virtue of the fact that our General Secretary is Chairman of the Trade Union Congress, and therefore a great effort will be made to keep to the official Labour movement line.

The Conference will be important especially in view of the fact that during the past two years the membership has been on the move, many unofficial strikes having taken place in its many and varied sections. The Passenger Section has been to the forefront in this respect—the United Counties, the Scottish S.M.T., the Green Line, the Maidstone and District and 15 Counties strikes, and, of course, the official London bus strike, all indicative of the rising determination of the members of this Union to win better conditions.

Enquiries will have been held into these, and will be the subject of reports to the Conference, which will create a very big discussion. Whilst the Executive Council have a point of view, they will find it very difficult to prove that these were other than genuine strikes where workers were actually suffering bad conditions. In other words, they will have to try and prove that smoke exists without fire.

Another issue that will be decided at this Conference will be a report from the Executive Council on what is termed " unofficial " movements. On this important item many fanatical statements will be made. Every meeting that has taken place that the officers consider unwarranted, will be classed as " unofficial." Suggestions and innuendoes galore will be made that these are the result of the activity of the Communists, and the red herring of Moscow will be drawn across the path of the discussion.

Then we come to the important discussion that will take place on the question of unity in the political field. Here again the big guns will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burst forth, with an Executive Council decision behind them, against united action.

Spain will be discussed at length, many resolutions dealing with aid and with the National Council of Labour's policy in relation thereto having been tabled.

The Trades Disputes Act is a hardy annual and on this occasion action must be taken by the Union to see it eradicated from the Statute Book.

Attacks will be made by resolution upon the National Government and its policies, foreign, financial and industrial, and delegates will have to be on the alert, especially in relation to resolutions dealing with the Government's rearmament policy.

The Means Test, the fight against fascism and other matters are upon the agenda, and on these crucial issues if only united action could be taken by the working class movement as a whole, with the Transport and General Workers' Union giving the lead, this would place the Labour movement years in advance of the present time and would regain much of the ground lost and wipe out much of the discredit that has been brought upon our movement by its reactionary policy in recent years.

The time of the Conference will be much occupied with the London bus dispute, the results and conduct of which are a new era in the history of reaction in the trade union movement. It is worth considering, when voting and deciding upon this important issue, what effect the decisions of the Executive Council may have upon individuals as delegates, Branch Secretaries, and other lay members and even the Sections and Branches to which the delegates belong.

Increases of salaries to the officers of our organisation will be another matter that will be debated with much candour.

There are many other items of real importance that one could deal with, but of one thing I am sure—whatever the decisions of this Biennial Conference, the march of progress of the members of this Union cannot be stayed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANGLO-GERMAN INTERESTS IN SPAIN

By CONRAD SUDEN

ALL the world knows that it is Hitler's intention, through his military intervention in Spain, to transform that country into an appendage of the Third Reich, with Franco as a vassal for use in the reckoning with France. But the path now being followed by the General Staff and soldiers of the Third Reich had been opened up not long before their arrival by German finance capital, which prepared the ground for the war and whose real economic interests in Spain became the motive force of Hitler's campaign. The big bankers, the heads of the chemical industry, the lords of coal and iron, cast their votes in favour of letting loose the Spanish war. The bombing planes over Durango and Guernica shrieked the demands of the big business men of Germany for markets and raw materials.

Who are these big business men? With a few exceptions, the millionaires of Germany have never pressed forward into the light of publicity. They have always preferred to stop in the background and to get their political business done for them by other people. In the case of Spain we find them concealed behind the colourless designation: *Metallgesellschaft A.G.* (Metal Company Ltd.), Frankfurt-on-Main, with innocent articles of incorporation like the following:

> "Object of the undertaking: acquisition and smelting of ores, with further metal working processes; banking and financial business; trading, especially in ores, metals and other products. . . . The company is empowered to initiate industrial undertakings of every kind, to participate in such undertakings and to deal in their products . . . The industrial activity of the Metallgesellschaft extends over every phase of the metal industry, from the mining of ores and the production of crude metals to numerous categories of finished goods."

When Franco's rebellion broke out in July, 1936, and the links with Hitler's Consulates became clear,* the searching of a few houses brought an overwhelming mass of political material to light, proving the complicity of the German Fascists. But yet more was found. Documents were discovered, dating from April, 1935, when the reactionary Gil Robles still dominated Spain and could guarantee by his own signature the assurance that

> The Spanish Government is disposed to grant mining concessions to those German industrialists who apply for them.

*Documents found in the Nazi headquarters in Barcelona and elsewhere and submitted to the League of Nations, etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These concessions were to be one of the ways in which Spanish fascism returned thanks for the military aid which the Third Reich was to supply to it.

The Metallgesellschaft went full steam ahead and decided to establish a big German settlement in Spain, with the object of taking over the mines delivered up by Gil Robles, thus making the Third Reich " completely independent of London, France and Sweden " in regard to ores and to iron, as one of the discovered documents declares. Close co-operation with Italian capital had been planned from the first, and about a year later, in the spring of 1936, this resulted in an agreement between the Metallgesellschaft and the Federation of Italian Industry, through which the necessary finance was supplied by Italian insurance companies.

The Metallgesellschaft had begun by sending along experts—technicians, chemists, etc.—to investigate the nature of the Spanish mines. The gentlemen of the Company were particularly interested in the coal supply of the Isabena mines in Aragon. The reserves there are estimated at 20 million tons and the investigation is specially concerned with the possibility of setting up distilleries for oil and benzine on the spot. Why in Spain and not in Germany ? Because, as expressly stated in one of the reports, in case of war Spain must be the fuel supply station for German submarines and airplanes. For one sector of Hitler's totalitarian war is to be the Mediterranean, where the task of his aeroplanes and submarines is to cut France off from her colonies.

The agents of the Metallgesellschaft sent in reports from every quarter of Spain : on the asphalt and the coalfields of Cáceres, the antimony mines of Oviedo, the hematite of Villalba, the tin of Viego, the graphite of Toledo, the copper mines of Gerona, the nickel deposits in the River Esera and in the province of Huesca, the tin mines of Galicia and the gold of Aneto.

The gentlemen of the Metallgesellschaft particularly insisted that the analyses of all these metals should be carried out in Germany itself ; these were usually undertaken in the laboratories of the great chemical trust, I. G. Farben ; some were also carried out in the Humbold-Deutz Motor Works ; they showed positive results of a satisfactory kind clearly reflected in the letters and documents. Gil Robles' offer was accepted and in January, 1936, the negotiations with the Italian industrialists were speeded up. For in February, 1936, the general elections were to take place ; a victory for Gil Robles was expected, and after that the German and Italian industrialists would be able to take the mineral wealth of Spain under their own control.

The victory was won, however, not by Gil Robles, but by the Popular Front, whose programme included among other items, nationalisation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mines. Nevertheless, at the end of April, 1936, the agreement between the German and Italian mining interests was officially concluded.

Very interesting. But still more interesting is the fact that up to the 18th of July, 1936, when the Rebellion began, the People's Front Government in Madrid had never received a single request or demand of any kind, either from the Germans or the Italians, for the allotment of any mining concession. A proof that the German or Italian capitalists concerned had not the slightest intention of addressing themselves to the legal Republican Government of Spain, but were informed of and active participators in the preparations for the military putsch, for which the slogan was to be " Save European Civilisation from Bolshevism "—the " civilisation " to be saved being the vast stores of precious minerals.

But with whom have we really to do in this Frankfurt Metal Company ? The Chairman of the Board of Directors is Dr. Richard Merton, a man largely unknown to the German public. He is also Chairman of Directors of the Sachtleben Co., which runs a number of mining concerns and chemical factories in the Rhineland, and Chairman of Directors of the Silesian Mining and Smelting Co. He is likewise a director of the great German chemical trust I. G. Farben, of the Aero-Union, of the North German Refinery, Hamburg, of the Lehnkering Co.—a trading company with a fleet of steamers, barges, etc. on the Rhine—and of various other mining, shipping and allied concerns. Here we already get a preliminary indication of the capitalist strength involved in the Frankfurt Metallgesellschaft. How much more widely this actually extends is shown by the names of two more of its directors—Karl Bosch and Baron von Siemens.

Bosch is chairman of the directors of I. G. Farben, the giant chemical trust with its share capital of 800 million marks ; he is director of over a dozen other companies, among them the Ford Motor Co., the Nobel Dynamite Trust (closely connected with Imperial Chemical Industries), Rhein-Metall-Borsig, etc.

Siemens controls all the various Siemens' concerns—Siemens & Halske, Siemens & Schuckert, Siemens Plania, etc. We meet him in the Deutsche Bank, the Vereinigten Stahlwerken—the amalgamation of steelworks which is Germany's next greatest trust after I. G. Farben—in the Gelsenkirchen Mining Co., the Mannesmann Co., etc.* With Siemens and Bosch, two of the decisive factors in German economic life enter the direction of the Metallgesellschaft, two decisive factors in the chemical industry and in industrial capitalism.

Finance capital proper is represented by Dr. Otto Jeidels, by Gustav Schlieper, and others. Jeidels owns the Berlin *Handelsgesellschaft*, the

*The Siemens Electrical Company (Industria Electria) has already conquered an important place in the Spanish market and is to be found in Madrid, Barcelona, Bilbao, Cornella, Gijon, Granada, Murcia, Palma, Santander, Seville, Valencia, Valladolid, Saragossa, and in Palma and Santa Cruz.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most distinguished and exclusive bank in Germany, and it can be said of him that no directorship, from colonial trading to Ruhr mining, from steel to life insurance, from nitrogen to art paper, is foreign to him. Schlieper is a director of the Deutsche Bank and Diskontogesellschaft. He is a marked example of what the Nazis in their early agitational days used to call a bank and stock exchange wolf. His key positions in the economic world lie scattered from Shanghai, where he governs the German-Asiatic Bank, to the Saar (Stumm-Besitz and Neunkirchen Iron Works), from South-West Africa (Otavi mines), to Sofia (Credit Bank) ; they are to be found in Amsterdam trading companies, in German arms and munitions factories, in Vienna's largest banks, in German salt mines, in Zeiss-Ikon and in the Compania Hispano-Americana de Electricidad in Madrid. We find that he is director or chairman of directors in at least 35 concerns, but we do not claim that this total is complete.

Others who should be named are Franz König, partner in the well known bank of Delbrück, Schickler & Co., and Hermann Schmitz, chairman of the directorate of I. G. Farben, who is at home in every branch of the European and American arms industry, and, by reason of his thirty odd directorships, has even been put in the Reichstag by the Nazi destroyers of monopoly.

Within the circle formed by the Metallgesellschaft the most powerful sections of big business in the Third Reich stand behind Hitler's intervention policy in Spain ; their interests direct the pressure of the Fascist armies upon those regions where the most important mineral wealth, essential for future German armaments, is to be found.

Relations with British Capital

No lengthy disquisition is required to prove that the intervention of Hitler and Mussolini in Spain, which is to transform the Mediterranean into an Italian domain, is a threat not only to France, but to Britain. All the more astonishing does it appear at first glance that British imperialism should have more than once expounded the policy of non-intervention as meaning : " No intervention against fascist intervention."

It is to be noted that two of the advance guard of British finance capital have found a place in the Metallgesellschaft : Mr. Walter Gardner and Captain Oliver Lyttleton, D.S.O., M.C., directors in London of the Amalgamated Metal Corporation, a gigantic concern with an issued capital of over £5,000,000 which maintains close relations with such British trusts as the International Nickel Co. and the Imperial Smelting Corporation. Captain Oliver Lyttleton is also managing director of the British Mining Corporation and a director of 17 other mining and metal companies in various quarters of the globe (Burma, Australia, etc.). This explains something, but not everything.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why, for instance, did British capitalism view with such calmness the blatant theft of the products of the British Rio Tinto Company's mines in South-West Spain, when Franco requisitioned the rich Rio Tinto copper ore to pay Hitler for his shipments of arms and troops ? That copper was shipped in German ships to Germany.

The answer is simple. The Rio Tinto Co. Ltd. stands in the closest financial relations with the Frankfurt Metallgesellschaft and shares with it the joint control of the European Pyrites Corporation Ltd., which deals in the iron pyrites and sulphur produced at Rio Tinto, constituents of enormous importance in the manufacture of explosives. The official report of the last General Meeting of the Rio Tinto Co. Ltd. (*Financial News*, April 30, 1937), shows the intimate relations between it and the Frankfurt Metallgesellschaft. On this occasion the chairman of the Rio Tinto Co. (the Rt. Hon. Sir Auckland Geddes, K.C.M.G.), ended his report with the following tribute :

> "We have lost by death . . . one of our most valued associates, Mr. Hermann Winkler, who for many years was on the Continent of Europe the outstanding personality in the pyrites world. . . . He was a strong link in the chain of our association with the Metallgesellschaft of Frankfurt on Main, which has spanned half a century, throughout which that company has rendered great service to the metallurgical, chemical and fertiliser industries of his country and to our own particular trade."

The links between the Rio Tinto Co. and the Metallgesellschaft extend very far. For the directors of Rio Tinto include some highly distinguished British personages : Sir Auckland Geddes, K.C.M.G., former Ambassador in Washington ; the Earl of Bessborough, who as President of the Corporation of Foreign Bondholders and a member of the League Loans Committee has a powerful influence in the City ; Sir Francis Joseph, K.B.E., etc., director of the Birmingham Small Arms Corporation and of the Midland Bank ; the Earl of Denbigh, director both of Rio Tinto, of the Pyrites Co., and of the Midland Bank. The Rio Tinto Co. is also closely tied up with the Rothschilds, who helped to finance it.

In what direction Sir Auckland Geddes, ex-Ambassador, and his noble co-directors use their very considerable influence at the Foreign Office was made clear at the meeting already referred to :

> "Since August 28 the conditions under which our business has been carried on have been extremely complicated. Copper, pyrites and sulphur have been requisitioned in substantial amounts and despatched to points in Spain, to Germany and Italy. Against these requisitions some pesetas have been received, some are owing. . . . In this way the *de facto* Government (of Franco) was able to secure foreign credits."

Hence is was " impossible to make profits out of the operations in Spain." The company's report therefore records : " Proceeds of Requisitions, Franco Territory, amount not yet received, 3,631,918 pesetas of unknown

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£ sterling value." A lot of money. But it is better to lose some profits to Franco than to allow the workers to become masters by the victory of the Popular Front. Sir Auckland Geddes admits that " during the time that the mines were in the hands of the Labour leaders (up to August 26, 1936), the British staff was well treated " ; what suffered was the rate of profit :

> " It is interesting to note that with 6,000 me nemployed in December, 1936, we were able to export 143,000 tons of ore, 30,000 tons more than we were able to export in the month of May with 8,500 men employed. This is a measure of the *economic waste forced on the Company by the decrees of the Popular Front.* Since General Franco's forces occupied the mines area there has been no labour unrest. During the period of disturbances in that area there were some atrocities *perpetrated by drunken mobs. The perpetrators and others*, dealt with by court martial, were *found guilty and shot.*" (Our italics.)

Nothing neglected, in fact. And of what use is the long established connection between Rio Tinto and the Metallgesellschaft if behind the scenes an agreement cannot be reached which will prevent the British owners of Spanish copper from coming off too badly ?

Another many-sided Anglo-German complex is the German " Stolberg " Company, founded for purposes of mining and lead and tin smelting in Stolberg and Westphalia, but owning a number of silver and lead mines in Spain. One of its directors is Herr Richard Merton, already mentioned, and the company itself is controlled partly by the Metallgesellschaft and partly by the fantastic adventurer and Nazi supporter, Otto Wolff, whose history is too long to retail here, while another of the five directors is the banker, Heinrich von Stein, whose partner in the Cologne banking house Stein is Baron Kurt von Schroeder (in whose home the reconciliation between Hitler and von Papen was brought about three weeks before Hitler came to power). Kurt von Schroeder belongs to the same family as Baron Bruno Schroeder of the famous British bank J. Henry Schroeder & Co. It was the British bank of Schroeder which recently organised the barter method or direct exchange of goods between Germany and the British Empire in order to spare Hitler the necessity of exporting securities, thus enabling him to keep his cash for armaments. No wonder Stein and Schroeder are to be found seated side by side in every German trust and are also taking part in the Spanish share-out.

A third bond between German and British big business is formed by the great electricity company, " Chade " (Compania Hispano-Americana de Electricitad), Madrid. Here strings of Spanish grandees are also involved. Fifteen years ago this electricity company was mainly concerned with South America, where it monopolised much of the electric power—*e.g.*, in Buenos Aires. It is now established in Europe as well and plays a large part in French and Canadian electricity undertakings,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Berlin " Gesfürel " (Electrical Undertakings Co.), as well as in the biggest electricity trust in the world—the Sofina. Its board of directors is a galaxy of Spanish aristocrats and of other Europeans with humbler titles but perhaps more power. The German directors, Alfred Blinzig, Georg Solmssen and Oscar Oliven link it to the Deutsche Bank and to the Austrian Alpin Montangesellschaft (which financed the Nazi putsch in Austria in July, 1934), whilst Hermann Bücher, chairman of the Rathenau General Electric Co., is a director of two Madrid electrical (electric and lamp manufacturing) companies, and of the Compania General Electrica Espagnola in Bilbao, in which the Rathenau Co. has invested almost two and a half million pesetas. No wonder Bilbao has to be won for Franco.

The British directors of " Chade " are Sir Edmund Wyldebore-Smith, director of the Suez Canal Co., Vice-President of the Federation of British Industries, Vice-President of the International Sleeping Car Co., chairman of Thos. Cook & Sons, director of many other important companies; and Mr. Bernard Dudley Frank Docker, director of over a dozen important companies and of the Midland Bank, the connections of which with the Rio Tinto Co. have already been shown. And, finally, a vital link, that distinguished nobleman, his Grace James Stuart Fitzjames, etc., the millionaire Duke of Berwick and Alba, descended both from our evicted King James II. and from Alba the scourge of the Netherlands, premier grandee of Spain, owner of gigantic estates and the official representative in London of General Franco.

The bonds between British and German capitalism in Spain do not account for the whole policy of British imperialism in its betrayal of democracy, its alliance with fascism ; they do, however, constitute a factor of which the great importance is often overlooked.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND MARXISM*

By J. D. BERNAL

IN the decade after the war Freud's theories dominated the narrow circles of British intellectuals. His psycho-analysis was accepted warmly for many reasons. It was new and exciting, it was shocking, it debunked religion and morals, it promised an internal liberation from all restraints. Nevertheless, it was essentially a creed of escape into an inner world of complexes and repressions and away from social and economic realities.

In recent years the Freudian wave has begun to recede. The effects of the world economic crisis of capitalism, and of the close menace of fascism and war, startled the intellectual strata into awareness of the objective world, and aroused a new wide interest in marxism, which the polite educated world had hitherto conspired to ignore and now approached like a new discovery.

It was inevitable, however, from this ill-digested process of thought that the demand should arise to " reconcile " Freud and Marx. The present book is an expression of this stage of extremely immature and uninformed confusion.

Great as the spread of marxism has been in the past few years it has by no means gone far or deep enough. Marxism is disturbing to existing habits ; and it is only to be expected that once plain rejection and suppression are found no longer possible, attempts are made to water Marx down—to reconcile his ideas with existing fashionable modes of thought. Thirty years ago in Russia Machian positivism, so devastatingly castigated by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, was the fashionable intellectual creed ; to-day we have the Freudian psychology. It is nevertheless a sad comment on the backward state of marxist knowledge in this country that such a book as Freud and Marx could be written at all, and still more serious that it should be so warmly recommended by such a well-known marxist writer as John Strachey.

* * * *

Mr. Osborn writes as if Freud and Marx had never been considered in juxtaposition before. He has never read, or shows no sign of having read, any of that voluminous amount of discussion on the subject already published in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. Worse still, however,

**Freud and Marx.* By R. Osborn. Gollancz, 7s. 6d. (Left Book Club, 2s. 6d.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost every line of the book reveals a purely superficial understanding of marxism and a complete failure to grasp its essential principles.

He has, in effect, given a brief and far from adequate account of Freudian theory, which he accepts quite uncritically. There follows an interpretation, in hybrid marxist terms, of Primitive Society, Historical Materialism and Dialectical Materialism. The general thesis is that Freud and Marx are to be reconciled in a dialectical way as two opposites, one representing the psychological and the other the material understanding of humanity. Out of the fusion of these is to come a superior understanding, some applications of which are given us in the last chapter.

Put in its strongest form, the argument is that psycho-analysis gives us a scientific interpretation of human motive which was not available to Marx and Engels. Had they been alive to-day they would—so it is argued—have accepted it as they accepted Darwinism. As they are not alive, the duty devolves on us to demonstrate by what processes they would have reached the stage of acceptance. There is, however, all the difference in the world between the methods of Marx and Mr. Osborn. Marx, while welcoming Darwin's scientific results, was never for a moment taken in by his philosophy. For his part, Mr. Osborn accepts Freud's philosophy without apparently realising how completely the work of Marx and Engels has already made it untenable.

The issue is a fundamental one. Freudism can—to an even less extent than Darwinism—not be treated as an experimental science, to be incorporated like Physics or Chemistry in the marxist interpretation of the objective world. Still less can Freudism be regarded as a dialectic complement to Marxism. For all its apparent materialism it is in effect just one more form of subjective philosophy and must be understood and rejected as such. This is not to deny the greatness of Freud's own work in clinical psychology or the importance of some of the relationships in human behaviour which it has brought to light. These, though they cannot by themselves be said to constitute a science of psychology, are a contribution to science. In order to make use of them we need to separate them carefully and critically from the almost mythical and continually changing theories that are involved in their presentation.

* * * *

The implication of this book is that marxism is deficient in psychological interpretation and that this deficiency can be met by psycho-analysis. In actual fact it is through Marx, and not through Freud, that we can begin to understand the significance and the possibilities of psychology. Marx does not start, as Freud does, with the idea of an essentially unalterable human psychology from which sociology can be derived. On the contrary he makes humanity for the first time comprehensible as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new quality which arises from social aggregation. We must understand society before we can understand man.

Human nature is not constant ; it can be and is being moulded by society. Freud is incorrect when he produces, from his study of the psychology of the bourgeois family a generalisation to fit the whole human race, reaching as far back as the hypothetical primal horde with its jealous and terrible father. To accept the Freudian analysis is to accept by implication a completely non-dialectical view of psychology which must destroy the whole basis of marxist analysis. While ignoring the development of the world process, the rise of classes and the struggles between them in which human nature is formed and transformed, the Freudian interaction seeks to set up the individual, and the bourgeois individual at that, as the centre and measure of all things.

It is clear that Mr. Osborn has not only failed to notice this basic incompatability, but throughout his book he even tries to adduce a detailed parallelism between Freudian and marxist ideas. Many of these attempts are glaring distortions, as for instance when he seeks to establish the similarity of Freud's and Engels' views on the origin of the family, whereas in fact these views are almost diametrically opposite. Even more glaring is the attempt of Strachey in the preface to equate the " false consciousness " of Engels with the Freudian unconscious.

* * * *

Though more easily recognisable, the political aberrations that are contained in the second part of the book are merely natural consequences of this initially defective theoretical approach. Nevertheless, some are sufficiently extreme to warrant special mention. The author identifies the influence of traditional, and consequently counter-revolutionary, forces with the Freudian super ego, thence drawing the conclusion that it is necessary to weaken the super ego and substitute ego-morality for super ego-morality. This is apparently considered to represent or amplify the marxist idea of class-consciousness. There could not be a more gross distortion.

The essence of marxism is not that it substitutes one psychological attitude for another but that it provides an objective and scientific picture of the processes of social change—of the inevitable breakdown of capitalism and the rôle of the working class in bringing it about. As a result of this disintegration and through active participation in the political and economic struggles of the workers, old loyalties give place to new, but the new loyalties are on an altogether different plane of consciousness.

Related to this misconception of marxism is the idea that as the material necessity for socialism is now overwhelming, all the resistance to the process of socialisation must therefore be psychological, and that psychology

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should consequently now play a decisive part in the struggle. In the first place this analysis of the current situation is wide of the facts.

The rising wave of working-class activity in all countries of the world to-day springs, like other previous waves, from a keen awareness of the economic situation and its effect on the workers. But there is to-day a far wider and deeper consciousness of the instability of capitalism than ever before. What dams up the wave is not bad psychology but the tardy development of the workers' political organisation, disunity, and the widespread prevalence of the ideas of social democracy and class collaboration. To suggest an appeal to psychology at the present time is to attempt to graft on to the tactics of Marxism an entirely subjective factor.

This is the logical deduction from the false antithesis of subjective and objective which underlies most of the book. To the marxist the subjective world is not opposed to, but part of, the objective world, and this is recognised in practice by the inclusion of psychology in revolutionary tactics. The idea of psychology as an independent dynamic element in politics leads straight to the "change of heart" school—the pacifists and liberal apologists of capitalism.

* * * *

Actually the author is led further than this, for he advocates as the chief practical application of his theories a Communist leadership which in everything but the words constitutes the Führer principle of the Fascists. The "leader" is to be made into a father figure in whom his followers are to have infinite confidence and such an attitude would completely justify the reactionary propaganda of those who reject "dictatorship of the Right and of the Left" because they see no difference between Fascism and Communism.

In actuality the principles of leadership under Communism on one hand and Fascism on the other, are fundamentally opposed. The whole psychological apparatus of the Fascist "leader" is designed to deceive his followers and to distract their attention from the operations of the real masters of the State. In Communism, leadership comes from below, it is the leadership of the class and of the class-conscious party within that class. Individuals are important, but only in so far as they crystallise in definite actions the determination of the party and the class.

Communist leadership is objective in a full sense. It does not neglect psychology—it would be poor leadership if it did—but its psychology is an integral part of the appreciation of the concrete situation as a whole. The Communist is urged to think, not to trust. The ideal Communist is one who will know, even if he is isolated from all others as Dimitrov

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was, what has to be done, and does it. The ideal Fascist is one who will obey any order without question.

It is only necessary to compare a speech of Stalin's with one of Hitler's to see what a vast gulf divides the two conceptions of leadership. It is intended that the mistakes of Communist leadership, and there have been many, should be cured by deeper analysis of the situation, by better organisation, by the training of really class-conscious workers—not by using " psychology " to increase the self-confidence of the leaders and whip up the blind devotion of their followers.

* * * *

Enough has been said to show how far Mr. Osborn's book wanders from the path of marxism. Yet he is probably less to blame than those marxists who have never discussed the relations of Freud and Marx at all. Freudian influence is an objective fact, and is spreading slowly out from the bourgeois circles where it originated. Politically, it is a profoundly dangerous influence, paralysing action and tending to Fascism. Yet little or nothing is being done to combat it in this country.

The workers demand and have the right to demand a knowledge of psychology. If all they get is Freudian psychology, this is because English marxist writers have not applied themselves to the subject or even translated what has been written elsewhere. The one good effect the book should have—to provoke active discussion—may, it is hoped, produce serious analysis and criticism of the issues involved.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR SOCIALISM IN CEYLON

LABOUR MONTHLY *readers will be interested in the account given below of the condition of Ceylon under British imperialism and of the aims and struggles of the young Socialist Party of Ceylon (Lanka Sama Samaja Party). This statement was submitted by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party to the Conference on Socialism in India and Ceylon held at Transport House, London, on the 5th and 6th June,* 1937.

THE mass movement in Ceylon for the establishment of a Socialist State and national independence has taken a different course from that of the Indian movement. In India the National Congress has been the natural growth of a great common front of all elements striving for national emancipation and to-day the Socialist movement has a definite place and a historic mission within it.

In Ceylon there had been no mass movement during the last twenty-five years until the young leaders, who subsequently formed the Lanka Samajaya Party, started agitation and propaganda among the workers and peasants.

Since the British occupation of the entire country in 1815, the methods of repression adopted by British imperialism have been far more effective in Ceylon than in India. Easier accessibility of the entire country and the favourable insular climate for the British exploiter resulted in the complete political and economic subjection of the people. The rulers saw the vast economic possibilities in the exploitation for commodity crops of the fertile hill districts inhabited by the Kandyan peasants. Thus the early Imperial policy was to destroy the semi-feudal and self-sufficient village organisation with its Gensabhawa or self-governing institution and to introduce the wage labour system.

The extreme distress and poverty arising out of the unsettlement of the village economy resulted in a peasant rising in 1818, suppressed with ruthless massacre. According to a British observer : " Whenever a district rose in rebellion one or more military posts were established in it. Martial law was proclaimed. The dwellings of the resisting inhabitants were burnt, their fruit trees were often cut down. The country was scoured in every direction by small detachments and 10,000 Kandyan villagers were killed and most of their cattle and crops destroyed." Many villages were abandoned and the people fled into the jungle.

From 1818 to 1848 extensive coffee plantations were opened up by British planters on land misappropriated from the villagers. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor and other high officials were the pioneer proprietory planters. The Governor enacted a law which enabled him to confiscate without compensation the traditional village pasture lands and forest reserves. This land was sold for a nominal price to the British investors. To benefit the British planter, export duty on estate produce was abolished and every conceivable form of taxation, direct and indirect, was forced on the peasantry. Import duties on all imported goods were introduced. Shops, boats and all vehicles were taxed £1 annually. Every dog in the village was taxed. As the peasants were living on the verge of starvation, sufficient revenue was not forthcoming to enable the opening up of estate roads at Government expense, and for the heavy cost of maintaining the British Administration for the benefit of the planters. All major and minor irrigation works in the villages were abandoned. Forced labour was introduced, and the peasants were compelled to work six days in the year on roads in the plantation districts within a radius of 20 miles round their village.

These oppressive measures resulted in a peasant rising in 1848. Martial law was again declared and the military officers and the planters were put in command and once again the wholesale massacre of peasants was carried on for several months after the rising was suppressed. A few British liberal elements were able to raise protests in the British Parliament. A Parliamentary Committee with Mr. Gladstone as a member was appointed to investigate into the grave charges against British officials. This Committee, being convinced of the guilt of the British officials, refused to send a Royal Commission to Ceylon as it would have undermined the prestige of the Governor.

In 1915 the widespread economic distress among the Sinhalese peasants and workers resulted in sporadic rioting, which took the form of a religious class with the Mohammedans. After the disturbances had ceased, for several weeks the European planters and the police shot down unarmed and innocent peasants. Under martial law several innocent Nationalists were persecuted.

The morale of the peasantry was so badly destroyed by these repeated acts of terrorism that Imperialist exploitation continued unchallenged for several decades.

The masses are subjected to a double form of exploitation. On the one hand the survival of the semi-feudal headman system is used to keep the peasant in bondage. On the other, the peasant is exploited by all the methods of modern capitalism. Within recent years an English-educated Ceylonese gentry of landed proprietors has come into prominence and become increasingly absorbed into the legislative and executive bodies ; and in the absence of a mass movement they enjoyed power and privilege as lackeys of British Imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1937 the wages of unskilled workers in Government factories are the same as in 1857, although the cost of living has risen beyond all comparison. The average wage is about 7d. or 8d. per day, and in Colombo the price of a bottle of milk is 4d. or 5d. The wages in British factories and warehouses are even less. The wages of skilled labourers have undergone progressive reduction in all trades and industries. Thus after a hundred and forty years of British rule the people of Ceylon are faced with poverty amidst all the material perquisites of prosperity. People are still attempting to maintain life with primitive and unproductive methods of agriculture. The majority are condemned to live and die in poverty, squalor, ignorance and disease, while a small minority enjoy the comforts, privileges, leisure and opportunities which their disparate wealth affords them.

Six years ago the State Council of Ceylon was elected on a universal franchise. Limited as are its powers under the Donoughmore Constitution, the national leaders did not lack the opportunity to influence policy in the interests of the people. Instead of these opportunities being used, the apathy of the leaders in the face of political crisis, their co-operation with the British in imposing hardship and injustice on the people proved conclusively their readiness to subordinate the national interest to personal gain.

The representatives of popular emancipation became the agents of class domination. Blow after blow has been struck at the standard of living of the poor by heavy taxation of necessary foodstuffs, by Imperial preferences, quotas on cheap Japanese textiles. Two years ago over 90,000 perished in a few months of hunger and preventable malaria, reducing the countryside to a graveyard. Yet National leaders were entertaining Royal Dukes and celebrating Royal Jubilees at public expense, hunting for knighthoods and other honours. They relieved the rich of their responsibilities by repealing the estate duties and lightening the taxes paid by foreign exploiters.

Over 90 per cent. of the population are existing on the verge of starvation. The rural economic survey carried out in Kalutara, the most fertile and richest district in Ceylon, revealed 80 per cent. of the peasant families to be in debt. The conditions in the less fertile and malarial districts need no description. The army of unemployed has mounted to stupendous proportions, uncalculated and unprovided for. Half the children of school-going age have neither the opportunity nor the means of going to school. Over 30 per cent. of the children both in the urban and rural schools suffer from advanced diseases due to malnutrition. Our infant and maternal mortality rates are among the highest for the civilised world. Preventable diseases annually take a shocking toll of lives. The normal average span of life in Ceylon when undisturbed by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

epidemics has not been officially estimated, but is in the neighbourhood of 27 years. When epidemic conditions are taken into consideration the average expectation of life is below twenty.

Recent history has demonstrated that until the Sama Samaja Party was organised there has been no real advantage to the working masses in merely choosing every four years which members of the oppressing class should repress them in Council. In spite of the desperate condition of the masses the National leaders were satisfied with themselves and with the administration. This self-satisfaction was derived from the absence of a genuine opposition basing itself on a coherent body of economic and political principles.

All the world over there is to-day a fundamental conflict between two sets of principles which may form the basis of Governmental policy. They are the principles of disintegrating capitalism and those of advancing socialism. Recent history has amply demonstrated the inability of capitalism to ensure a decent existence to the large majority of human kind. In every country there is an increasing body of informed opinion which has become inalienably convinced that socialism provides the only practicable alternative to capitalism. What is more, it is now being increasingly realised that socialism alone can prevent war and give the universal opportunity of a full life.

The growing volume of socialist opinion in Ceylon coalesced into the Lanka Sama Samaja Party. The primary aim of the L.S.S.P. is the establishment of a socialist society in Ceylon. The essential economic basis of such a society is socialised production, distribution and exchange of commodities. Through socialisation alone can the popular needs be fulfilled.

The struggle for socialisation will inevitably bring to the surface the reality of foreign domination. The fight for popular rights involves a fight against the dominant power. The dominant power in our social system is helped by the capitalist class, the predominant section of which are the British exploiters. Behind the British capitalists stand the forces of British Imperialism. The greatest barrier to the establishment of socialism in Ceylon is therefore the existence of Imperialist rule. Accordingly for us the assault on capitalism necessitates the assault on Imperialism by the struggle for full National Independence.

Apart from the fundamental objectives of the establishment of a socialist society the L.S.S.P. formulated the following immediate demands :

(1) Abolition of domestic or industrial exploitation of child labour.
(2) Free supply of school books to children in primary schools.
(3) Free meals and milk to all children in primary schools.
(4) Free pasture lands in every rural district.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(5) Supply of seed paddy free of interest, to cultivators.
(6) Permanent abolition of irrigation rates.
(7) Abolition of the assignability of Tea and Rubber Coupons.
(8) Abolition of Forest Laws relating to removal of brushwood and the transport of timber.
(9) Establishment of unemployment insurance for all workers.
(10) Provision of work or maintenance for all in need.
(11) Establishment of a minimum wage so that all workers may maintain a decent level of life.
(12) Establishment of an eight-hour day for all workers.
(13) Abolition of the compulsory registration of Trade Unions.
(14) Factory legislation to ensure decent working conditions.
(15) Introduction of a Rent Restriction Act.
(16) Clearance of slums and provision of better and cheaper housing for workers.
(17) Use of the vernacular languages in the lower courts of law and in records at Police Stations ; and the extension of this use to all Government departments.
(18) Introduction of a scheme of National Health Insurance paying : 1. Sick benefits. 2. Old age benefits. 3. Maternity benefits.
(19) Steeper graduation of Income Tax on the higher incomes.
(20) Reimposition of Estate Duty on estates of Rs. 25,000 and over.
(21) Abolition of Imperial Preference and the Japanese Quota.
(22) Progressive abolition of all indirect taxation.

During the last six months three of these demands have been partially or wholly won by agitation in the State Council by the two L.S.S.P. members, backed by the mass campaign among the workers and peasants.

Free meals to all children in primary schools ; the use of vernacular languages in the lower courts of law ; and the reimposition of death duties on estates over Rs. 25,000 are the remarkable victories achieved. Several other demands are now the subjects for investigation by the Ministers for report to the State Council.

The L.S.S.P. has established cordial relations with the leaders of the Indian National Congress. Whenever circumstances permit the L.S.S.P. work in co-operation with the socialist leaders of India. Our delegates participated in the deliberations of the Congress Socialist Party last year. The lecture tour of Comrade Kamaladevi, member of the Congress Socialist Party, clearly demonstrated the solidarity of the masses in the two countries. Her meetings were attended by over 70,000 people.

The circulation of the official organ of the party was 10,000 six months ago. With the new printing press for which funds are now being raised by public subscriptions, the circulation can certainly reach 25,000.

The greatest internal weakness among the masses has been communal ill-feeling, which was exploited by self-seeking nationalists. The establishment of branch societies of the L.S.S.P. in the north of Ceylon where

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tamils predominate has laid a real foundation for true unity among the masses.

The Party's work for unity among the Indian immigrant labourers resulted in the recent outrageous attempt of the Ceylon Governor to deport one of the Party members. Comrade M. A. Bracegirdle, an Englishman, gave up planting, as the conditions of work of the labourers so revolted him, and joined the Sama Samaja Party to help organise labour. This created such a panic among the European planters that when persuasion by them and threats by the Inspector General of Police failed to compel Comrade Bracegirdle to give up his political activities the Governor intervened. Acting under powers vested in him during Queen Victoria's time to deal with any state of grave emergency, he ordered Bracegirdle's deportation.* A protest meeting in Colombo against the Governor's order was attended by 50,000 people, about half the total adult male population of the town.

The indignation of the masses against oppression and injustice is now seeking disciplined and organised expression under the leadership of the Sama Samaja Party. The leaders of the Ceylon National Congress who carried on an intensive campaign against the Sama Samaja Party have not only been discredited by the masses, but many of them have found it necessary to fight with the Sama Samaja Party against Imperialism and in defence of civic rights and democracy.

Thus the only elements in our society which can wholeheartedly and effectively carry on the struggle against Imperialism are the working masses. They cannot emancipate themselves without emancipating all society from the tyrannies, superstitions and prejudices of class, race, caste, creed and sex, which keep society divided and enslaved. Thus the need of the hour in our country is for a common front of all elements striving for emancipation in the battle-front of socialism, which alone can lead society to victory. The victory of socialism means the political supremacy of the working masses and therewith the abolition of every form of exploitation by the constutitional use of the new State power.

*The action of the Governor has since been declared illegal by the High Court of Ceylon.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN AND GORKY

The new series of Lenin's Letters which opens in this month's issue, will be selected from his important correspondence with Maxim Gorky, ranging over the political and theoretical struggles of more than ten years. The letters have been specially translated for the LABOUR MONTHLY *from the "Works of Lenin," Vols. XXVIII & XXXIX. Moscow, 1932.*

No. 201.

To A. M. Gorky at Capri.

(January 9, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear A.M.,

I arrived here with my wife a day or two ago. We both caught cold on the journey. We're fixing ourselves up here somehow, temporarily for the time being, and so everything is bad. Your letter greatly delighted me: certainly it would be important for me to come to Capri. You can be sure I shall somehow find time to visit you. But it is impossible at the moment, unfortunately. We've come here entrusted with the job of founding a paper: to transfer *The Proletarian* here from Finland. It isn't yet finally decided whether we shall choose Geneva or another town. In any case we have got to hurry, and there's a mass of jobs to do in connection with the new plan. But I'd like to visit you in the summer or spring, when the business is in working order! When is Capri particularly good to visit?

How is your health? How are you feeling? Is work going well? When passing through Berlin I heard that you and Lunacharsky had made a tour through Italy and particularly in Rome. Are you satisfied with Italy? Do you see many Russians?

I think it will be best to visit you when you do not have any big work on hand, so that we can roam and talk together.

Have you received my book (first volume of my collected articles over twelve years)? I gave instructions at Petersburg to send you a copy.

Huge greetings to Maria Fiodorovna. Au revoir!

Yours,

N. LENIN.

My address: Mr. V. L. Oulianoff, 7 Rue des deux Ponts. 17 (chez Kupfer), Geneve.

First printed in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I. Printed from the manuscript.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

p. 512.

No. 202.

To A. M. Gorky and M. F. Andreeva at Capri (Italy).
(January 15, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear A.M. and M.F.,

I received your express letter to-day. It is astonishingly tempting, dash it, to get away to you at Capri ! You have described it so marvellously that, by God, I certainly shall come, and I will do my best to bring along my wife with me. Only about the date I don't yet know : it is impossible not to be busy with *The Proletarian*,[1] and it is necessary *to put it on its feet*, to put the work in order at all costs. This will take a month or two, at a minimum. But it must be done. In the spring we shall vanish to drink white Capri wine and look around Naples and chat with you. By the way, I have begun to learn Italian, and, like any learner, I at once pounced upon the address written by Maria Fiodorovna : expresso instead of espresso ! Fetch me a dictionary !

Well in regard to the transport of *The Proletarian*. You've brought it on yourself by mentioning it. Now you won't so easily get away from us ! There is a host of commissions to give to M.F.[2] at once.

(1) To find without fail the secretary of the union of steamship employees and workers (there must be such a union !) on the boats maintaining communication with Russia.

(2) To learn from him *where* the boats *go from* and *to : how often.* In order that he may arrange without fail for us *transport* weekly. How much will this cost ? He must find a *reliable* man for us (is there such a thing as a reliable Italian ?) Will he need an address in Russia (say at Odessa) to deliver the papers at, or could they *temporarily* keep a small quantity at some Italian innkeeper's in Odessa ? This is *extremely important* for us.

(3) If it is impossible for M.F. herself to arrange this, to hunt around seek out, explain, check up, and so on, then let her without fail bring us into direct contact with the secretary and we will settle it with him by letter.

It is necessary to hurry with this business : we hope to issue *The Proletarian* here within two or three weeks, and it must be despatched immediately.

Well, au revoir at Capri ! Look after your health, A.M. !

Yours,

V. Ulyanov.

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I.

Printed from the manuscript.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

p. 523.

No. 208.

To A. M. Gorky at Capri (Italy).

(February 13, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear Al. M-ch.,

I think some of your agitated questions concerning our differences of opinion are due to pure misunderstanding. Of course, I was not thinking of " hunting the intelligentsia," as do the silly syndicalists, or denying that they are necessary for the working-class movement. On all *these* questions there *cannot* be disagreement among us ; I am absolutely certain of this, and since it is impossible to meet now, it is essential to begin to work together at once. Work is the easiest and best way to achieve complete harmony.

Your plan to write little things for *The Proletarian* (a preliminary announcement has been sent to you) pleases me very, very much. But it stands to reason, if you have big work on hand, *do not tear yourself away from it.*

Concerning Trotsky I wanted to answer you last time, but forgot. We (that is, the editorial board here of *The Proletarian*, Al. Al[3], myself and *The Monk*[4]—a very good colleague from the Russian Bolsheviks), at once decided to invite him on to *The Proletarian.* We wrote a letter and indicated and suggested a certain subject. By general agreement we signed it " Editorial Board of *The Proletarian*," wishing to put the matter on to a more collective basis (for example, I personally had a big battle with Trotsky, a desperate quarrel, in 1903-5 when he was a menshevik). Whether Trotsky took offence at this form, I do not know, but he sent a letter not written by himself : the editorial board of *The Proletarian* was informed by " p.p. Comrade Trotsky " that he refuses to write, that he is busy.

This is posing, in my view. At the London Congress also his behaviour was that of a poser. I don't know now whether he will go with the bolsheviks. . . .

The mensheviks have published here an announcement of the monthly *Voice of the Social Democrat* over the signatures of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Dan, Martov and Martynov. I shall get it and send it to you. The struggle may become exacerbated. But Trotsky wants to remain " above the warring fractions . . . "

About materialism precisely as a philosophic viewpoint, I think that essentially I am not of your opinion. And that, not in regard to " the materialist conception of history " (our " empirios "[5] do not reject that), but in regard to philosophical materialism. I flatly question whether the Anglo-Saxons and Germans were indebted to " materialism "

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for their philistinism, or the Latin peoples (indebted to it) for their anarchism.

Among them materialism as a philosophy *is everywhere kept in the background. Neue Zeit*,[6] a most restrained and informed organ, is indifferent to philosophy and was never an eager supporter of philosophical materialism, yet in recent times it has printed the empirio-critics without a single reservation. That one could subtract a dead philistinism from *that* materialism which Marx and Engels taught :—this is false, false ! All philistine movements in social democracy make war most of all upon philosophical materialism, and incline towards Kant, neo-Kantianism and critical philosophy. No, that philosophy which Engels provided with a basis in *Anti-Dühring* does not allow philistinism across its threshold. Plekhanov injures this philosophy by linking the struggle ***here*** with a fractional struggle, but not one single Russian Social-Democrat should confuse the present Plekhanov with the old Plekhanov.

Al. Al. has only just left me. I'll remind him over and over again about the " congress."[7] If you insist—it is possible to arrange it for a couple of days and shortly.

I shake your hand,

LENIN.

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I. Printed from the manuscript.

NOTES.

1. *The Proletarian.* A weekly Bolshevik journal, the first 20 numbers of which were published in Finland, whence it was transferred to Geneva to avoid repression.

2. M.F. Maria Feodorovna Andreeva, Gorky's wife.

3. Al. Al. A. A. Bogdanov, who with Lenin and Dubrovinsky had been entrusted with the task of starting *The Proletarian* in Geneva.

4. *The Monk.* I. F. Dubrovinsky.

5. *Our Empirios.* The Empirio-critics and Empirio-monists—Bogdanov, Bazarov and Lunacharsky. See Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.* (Martin Lawrence.)

6. *Neue Zeit.* The theoretical organ of the German Social Democratic Party, edited 1883-1917 by Kautsky. The last number appeared in 1923.

7. The Congress . . . Gorky had proposed that the Bogdanov group should meet with Lenin to discuss their differences. The meeting was never held.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

OUR MOVEMENT SINCE THE WAR.

The Post-War History of the British Working Class. By Allen Hutt. (Gollancz.) 6s. (The Left Book Club, June choice, 2s. 6d.)

IN Britain a steady stream of studies in economic and political theory, world affairs, and now in the history of the working-class movement, has appeared in recent years. They remind one of Marx's comments on the series of studies of the '48 which appeared in Paris in the late sixties, and which, as Marx said, foretold the rise of another wave of struggle against French reaction.

We, too, in Britain are striving to do, as best we may, what the French socialist writers and propagandists did in the sixties. We look back at the stormy, and for a moment quasi-revolutionary, period which the British working-class movement has lived through since the war and attempt to evaluate it and to draw conclusions from it, so that in the new period of far deeper storm and stress which is clearly almost upon us, we may not repeat all, at any rate, of our old errors.

To begin with the new intellectual ferment made itself felt in the more abstract spheres. From 1930 onwards a series of works on economic and political theory, which attempted to introduce their readers (and for that matter, in the case of most us, their writers also) to the marxist standpoint, appeared in this country. It is only recently, however, that our writers have turned their attention to the study of the specific questions which have faced, and which face, the British Labour Movement. This apparently paradoxical course of development, from the theoretical and abstract, to the specific and practical, was, after all, inevitable. Those of us who, like myself, have written some of the books in the series, had to attempt to settle our accounts with basic questions of economic and political theory before we could go on to attempt to apply a newly acquired standpoint to the issues of the day.

Allen Hutt, of course, belongs to the generation of English writers who came to marxism, not in the second marxist wave which struck England in the early 1930's, but in the first wave which struck it in 1919-20. But even he seems to have felt the need to do a semi-theoretical, semi-historical book like *This Final Crisis* before coming to grips with the questions of the hour. This new work of his is, however, a fully political and practical book. It is a history of such recent events that almost every line of it has a direct bearing on the present situation. There is little doubt that it will rank as the most finished and wholly successful contribution which Hutt has yet made to the literature of the movement.

In form it is a plain story told with a minimum of comment. It is a swiftly moving, and extremely vivid, narrative of all that has happened to and has been done by the British working-class movement since November, 1918. The relative sparsity of comment and interpretation seems to me both a weakness and a strength. I personally should have liked more interpretation, more theory. I should have liked the lesson of the events more overtly driven home. On the other hand, there is, no doubt, a great deal to be said for letting events tell their own story. It may well be that this unvarnished tale will actually have more influence than a more elaborate study would have had. This is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essentially a history of the deeds rather than the thoughts, the actions rather than the ideologies of the British Labour Movement in the post-war period.

After one has put the book down certain events stand out in bold relief. They are not necessarily the events which made the greatest stir at the time of their occurrence. The first of these is the Coalition Government's deception of the miners over the Sankey Commission. On page 19 Hutt prints Bonar Law's famous letter to the Secretary of the Miners' Federation promising to carry out, in the spirit and the letter, the recommendations of Sir John Sankey's Report. Here it is :

11 Downing Street,
Whitehall, S.W.
21st March, 1919.

Dear Sir,—Speaking in the House of Commons last night I made a statement in regard to the Government policy in connection with the Report of the Coal Industry Commission. I have pleasure in confirming, as I understand you wish me to do, my statement that the Government are prepared to carry out in the spirit and in the letter the recommendations of Sir John Sankey's Report.

Yours *faithfully*,
A. BONAR LAW.

Hutt's next few pages tell the well known story of the total repudiation of that promise so soon as the power of the miners had grown less. That is a simple, undeniable story of governing-class treachery which we should never tire of telling to every member of the Labour Movement. And yet it is hardly too much to say that the memory of it has been allowed almost to disappear. Nor, of course, is this unnatural. Those who have dominated the actions and the propaganda of the movement have been anxious to suppress the memory of such incidents ; for these incidents destroy the fundamental thesis of the present leadership of the Labour Party, namely, that the capitalists will always abide by the rules of the political game in their dealings with the working class. And yet, handled by a leadership which did not need to deceive itself, that one incident could have been enough to blow away all the illusions of the British workers in the fairness of their masters. If Hutt's book did nothing more than bring it to our notice, it would be a thousand times worth publishing.

The second great, and in a sense now half forgotten, incident is the formation of the Councils of Action by which the Coalition Government was forced to stop making war upon the Soviet Union. As one puts down the book one reflects that this was the one unqualified success which the British Labour Movement achieved during this whole period. On this occasion it really did defy the will of the governing class. It prevented that class carrying out a major item of its policy. In preventing the British capitalists from destroying the Soviet Union the British working-class movement undoubtedly changed world history and made possible the further development of human civilisation.

This one great success occurred on the one occasion on which the political and industrial power of the movement was unified. The Labour Governments were elected by a movement which ostentatiously disassociated itself from Trade Union activity. The politicians refused to have anything to do with the General Strike. The Labour Governments fell, the General Strike was betrayed. Only when the Councils of Action were formed to stop the war on the Soviet Union did the principle of the unity of all sides of the workers' struggle break through the whole disastrous tradition of the British Labour Movement.

It would of course be utterly untrue to suggest that the movement had done nothing else than this during the post-war period. Every one of the struggles

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the movement, however much they were betrayed, deflected and deserted, were in one sense successful. If the General Strike had not taken place, the entire British working-class would have suffered that immediate degradation in their standard of life which Mr. Baldwin promised them. Again, the struggles of 1932, 3, 4 and 5 waged by the Left wing of the movement on behalf of the unemployed had an immense effect in preventing the outright starvation of the distressed areas. Even the election of the two Labour Governments had, of course, some effect in delaying and checking the general development of British capitalist policy.

But when all this has been said, what an almost unbearably sad story is the post-war history of the British working-class movement. I have said that Allen Hutt has written a swiftly moving, stirring, attractive narrative, and so he has from the literary point of view. But the story he has to tell is one of such almost unmitigated tragedy that to read it requires a certain determination. The post-war history of our movement has not indeed been one of high tragedy. It has not risen to that level. It has been a tragedy of the frustration by tenth-rate leadership of the splendid, generous, courageous, heroic efforts of millions of British working men and women. Hutt's book ends with that tragedy of frustration still going forward. But he is able, in his concluding chapters, to record not only the deepening frustration caused by the ever-increasing reaction of the leaders of the movement, but also the rise of substantial new forces on the Left which give us the promise, though it is still no more, of the end of this long, sorry story.

I do not know for whom the book will be most valuable, whether for those young men and women coming into the movement who know little of what has happened in the past twenty years, or for those of us who lived through the greater part of this history. For to both categories it should act as a powerful exposure of what faulty leadership and unscientific ideology can do to a working-class movement. It points inexorably to the necessity of changing both these factors as the indispensable condition of the salvation of the British working class movement.

JOHN STRACHEY.

PALESTINE: THE IMPERIALIST VIEW.

Palestine at the Crossroads. By Ernest Main. (George Allen and Unwin.) 7s. 6d.

MR. MAIN'S book has several excellent qualities. It is factual. It is well documented. Above all it is honest. It is one of those valuable books which imperialists occasionally have the good nature to write, providing the anti-imperialist with just the material that he requires.

The book begins with a discussion of the general characteristics of Arabs and Jews, in which the author concludes that the Arabs represent a backward, and the Jews a progressive, force. He then puts the question—how to get these two diverse races to co-operate? This question, however, quickly fades into a second—how to order the affairs of Palestine in such a way that British interests in the Near East may be effectively safeguarded? To this his answer is that an "Arab" Palestine (by which he appears to mean an independent Palestine) would be weak,

> and a weak Palestine would be of little strategic interest to Britain, except in so far as it might serve as a barracks for troops.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Zionist Palestine on the other hand would be strong and prosperous. Consequently,

> if the British Government is satisfied that Palestine with a Jewish majority would be a help and not a hindrance to British Imperial policy, then the sooner a Europeanised progressive Palestinian state comes into existence the better.

The author consequently plumps for a Zionist Palestine, with Crown Colony status for a period of twenty or thirty years, to be followed by Dominion status. This form of Government " would at least ensure security and order."

All the cards are obligingly on the table. It is clear that co-operation between the two races is a purely secondary affair. What is urgent is that Palestine should be made safe for British imperialism. This can best be done by imposing a Jewish majority on the country. Crown Colony status would have the advantage of ensuring that for the twenty or thirty years the British Government will be able to coerce the Arab people without fear of interference by the League of Nations.

A pretty picture.

One fault of Mr. Main's is that disliking the Arab national movement, and regarding it as politically dangerous, he takes every opportunity to disparage it, and even to argue that it doesn't exist. Few Arabs, he says, have any political consciousness. Yet it is curious that these politically unconscious Arabs should have carried on a six-months' general strike against the Government in the face of the imprisonment of thousands and the shooting of hundreds of them and the destruction of their homes. Equally, it is unfair to say that

> the Arab, largely due to his antecedents, has little talent for constructive team-work,

without mentioning the fact that under the British Mandate effective control, both central and local, has remained in the hands of a few British officials, and that consequently no genuine opportunity has been given the Arabs for showing their " talent for constructive team-work."

On the subject of the Arabs Mr. Main is very ready to generalise : " according to Western standards " the Arab is venal. The Beduin " will not be helped and suspect every attempt to improve their lot." Agriculturally the Arab is no use : " scientific agriculture is quite beyond his ken." Such remarks are silly and misleading. In so far as Arabs are venal, and many are not, that is to be explained by the fact that they have lived for four hundred years under Ottoman rule when to be corruptable had high survival value. It cannot be proved that the Beduin suspect attempts to improve their lot since no determined effort has yet been made to improve it. What infinitesimal share of its annual budget does the Palestine Government spend upon health and education services for the Beduin ? Scientific agriculture is beyond the ken of the majority of Arab peasant farmers only because they are too heavily burdened by debt, land shortage, and high rents to be able to afford to introduce improved methods of farming.

Too many ill-considered general statements of this kind mar what is otherwise an interesting presentation of the Palestine question from a frankly imperialist point of view.

" British Resident."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NOVEL TO-DAY.

The Novel To-day. By Philip Henderson. (The Bodley Head.) 7s. 6d. 1936.

IN this book Mr. Henderson demonstrates strikingly the effect upon the novel of an author's position in the fight between capitalism and socialism. The contrast between the decay of the old novel of capitalism and the vitality of the new novel of socialism is brought home with unusual force by Mr. Henderson's singleness of purpose, his clear arrangement and apt quotation. One may think, for example, that one knows D. H. Lawrence : Mr. Henderson's treatment of him brings a fresh awareness of the appalling depths to which a man's mind may sink if, through lack of the conviction which would make him fight for socialism he loses faith in thought. The contrast between such horror and the promise, the already existing achievements, of the new novel of socialism cannot be exaggerated ; it is a good thing in Mr. Henderson's book that he shows it so strongly.

But though this contrast is not, and cannot be, overdone, the part played by the individual novelist is simplified. Mr. Henderson is inclined to neglect the fact that a bourgeois content, expressed in a particular form, may be by no means so reactionary as the simple plot suggests. He thus tends to isolate content from form, to minimise the value of writers like Proust and Virginia Woolf, and to suggest that all novels which are not openly revolutionary in content, are equally reactionary.

Beneath this undue simplification there is a confusion of ideas. Mr. Henderson makes an introductory distinction between " classical " and " romantic," which he supplements with a parallel distinction, drawn from Herbert Read, between novels which describe action and novels describing temperamental relationships. Both distinctions are loose ; neither is carried through consistently. If they were observed, the third section of the book, entitled " The Revolutionary Novel," ought rather to be called " the classical novel " or " the novel of action." It is in the relation of these conceptions " revolutionary," " classical," " action," that the confusion of thought lies. It is increased by a casual judgment on socialist realism : Mr. Henderson says of two novels by Sholokhov and Alexey Tolstoy that they " inaugurate no particularly new literary movement, except that they are both fine examples of what has come to be known as socialist realism, the canon of art that seems to be most favoured at the moment." " No new literary movement except socialist realism " is a contradiction in terms. And what other " particularly new literary movement " has Mr. Henderson in mind ? Probably because of this theoretical confusion Mr. Henderson stresses so exclusively the content of novels.

The Novel To-day is in many ways an improvement on Mr. Henderson's previous book, *Literature.* A certain hastiness and looseness of thought remains to be overcome.

ALICK WEST.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORY OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY.

THE Editorial Board of the LABOUR MONTHLY has had under consideration the review of Bell's *Short History of the British Communist Party* by Allen Hutt, which appeared in last month's issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY.

Although the general line of a critical treatment was necessary, and a critical treatment in principle had been agreed at a previous Board meeting, the tone of this review was far too sharp and personal in character, and the Editorial Board regrets that it should have appeared in last month's issue without previous discussion or revision.

Since the appearance of this review a statement of the Secretariat of the Communist Party has been published with regard to Comrade Bell's book, which states the necessary political criticism of the book in the following terms :

"In response to a number of questions and criticisms received, the Secretariat has had under consideration the book *A History of the British Communist Party*, by Comrade T. Bell.

"While recognising the urgent need for a history of the British Communist Party, in view of the increasing numbers of new members coming into the Party as well as of the increasing interest on all sides in the Communist Party, the Secretariat is compelled to regard this book as gravely unsatisfactory.

"Apart from numerous inaccuracies of detail, the book suffers from serious faults of political approach and treatment, which not only prevent it from giving a living picture of the Party's life and development against the background of the development of the Labour movement, but also lead to distortion of many vital phases of the Party's history.

"This applies especially to the introductory account of the forces of the working-class movement which went to make up the Party ; to the account of the first stage of transformation of the Party to organised mass work in the Labour Party and trade unions in 1922 ; to the account of the General Strike period and the lessons drawn by the Communist International ; to the changes of 1927-29, when it became necessary to make a sharp turn in the line ; and to the recent period of the development of the mass fight for unity since 1932, and especially since the Seventh World Congress.

"The Secretariat recognises that it was a mistake on the part of the central leadership of the Party not to have taken steps to secure revision of these faults before publication.

"The Secretariat desires to advise that this book should not be considered as a history of the Party."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Psycho-Analysis Explained. Dorothy R. Blitzsten. (Allen and Unwin.) 3s. 6d. 78 pp.

Germany's New Religion. Wilhelm Hauer, Karl Heim, Karl Adam. (Allen and Unwin.) 5s. 168 pp.

Robert Forman Horton. Albert Peel and J. A. R. Marriott. (Allen and Unwin.) 10s. 6d. 381 pp.

Christianity, Communism and the Ideal Society. James Feibleman. (Allen and Unwin.) 12s. 6d. 419 pp.

Rex V. Rhodes. A Novel. Edited by Bruce Hamilton. (Boriswood.) 8s. 6d. 389 pp.

Proudhon. Armand Cuvillier. 15 fr. 280 pp. *Pour Une Formation Bolshevik.* J. Stalin. 1 fr. 63 pp. *Trotski et le Trotskisme.* Textes et Documents. 2 fr. *Le Complot Contre la Revolution Russe. Les enseignements du proces de Moscou contre la Centre Terroriste Trotskiste-Zinovieviste.* 2 fr. 94 pp. *Paysans d'Espagne en Lutte Pour la Terre et la Liberté.* 3.50 fr. 150 pp. *Defense de la Paix.* Jean Jaurés. 2 fr. 77 pp. *De la Russie des Tsars à la Russie du Socialisme.* M. Kalinin. 1.50 fr. 30 pp. *Qu'est ce qu'on Aryan ?* M. Schlauch. 2 fr. (Bureau D'Editions, Paris.)

Lenin : Selected Works. Vol. 8. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.) 5s. 460 pp.

Facts About Fascism : Information Bulletin published by the Relief Committee for the Victims of Fascism. 1d. monthly

The Mind in Chains : Socialism and the Cultural Revolution. Edited by C. Day Lewis. (Frederick Muller Ltd.) 5s. 256 pp.

Mass-Observation. Charles Madge and Tom Harrison. (Frederick Muller Ltd.) 1s. 64 pp.

Hitler's Conspiracy Against Peace. S. Erckner (the pseudonym of a former Staff Officer in the German Army). (Gollancz.) 6s. 288 pp.

Women Must Choose : being an examination of the position of women in the Fascist countries, the U.S.S.R., and Western Democracy. Hilary Newitt. (Gollancz.) 7s. 6d. 288 pp.

Africa and World Peace. George Padmore. (Secker and Warburg.) 7s. 6d. 285 pp.

The White Sahibs in India. Reginald Reynolds. (Secker and Warburg.) 12s. 6d. 409 pp.

This Freedom of Ours. Frank Birch. (Cambridge University Press.) 6s. 226 pp.

The Jew in Revolt. William Zukerman. (Secker and Warburg.) 6s. 255 pp.

The Tongues of Men. J. R. Firth. (Watts and Co.) 2s. 6d. 160 pp.

Aspects of a Changing Social Structure. Sir Percy Alden, M.A. (Allen and Unwin.) 4s. 6d. 190 pp.

Pamphlets : *Memorandum on Rights and Liberties of Africans :* South African Native Policy. (London Group on African Affairs.) 3d. 18 pp. *It's Your Money.* Councillor Norman Tiptaft. (Lombard House, Birmingham.) 3d. 16 pp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A FLYING START

LAST month we indicated that our new appeal to end the Debt Fund for all time by freeing the LABOUR MONTHLY of debt would start from scratch. It has been given a flying start. One day, just shortly before the June issue was published, there blew into the office the biggest surprise we have yet had the pleasure of experiencing, in the shape of a donation for £100. Perhaps we should repeat while you are still out of breath—£100 from Comrade A. B. Thorne :—

> Here is something for the Debt Fund, which I hope will mean that it will shortly be entirely liquidated. I also hope that it will arrive in time for inclusion in the June lists, as that is all the acknowledgment I require.
>
> All good wishes, yours fraternally,
>
> A. B. THORNE.

Following rapidly on the £100 came a letter from E. S. Sachs, General Secretary of the Garment Workers' Union, Johannesburg :

> As an appreciation of the services which your magazine has rendered to the Trade Union and Labour Movement, my Union has decided to donate the sum of £4 in response to your appeal for funds.

The first part of Comrade Sachs' message is at once a call for that " readers' initiative " about which we spoke last month. The journal which has earned the support of a National Union for " services . . . . rendered to the Trade Union and Labour Movement " is the journal for which we make our three-fold appeal :

(1) To liquidate the debt by flooding the Debt Fund with contributions, following the grand lead given by Comrade Thorne, and thus to speed the Fund to success and final extinction.

(2) To build up the Guarantee Fund with contributions large or small to £20 a month to help us ride the storm until we achieve number three :

(3) To advance the sales to the ten thousand point through " readers' initiative."

Now is the time to follow the lead of our Comrade Thorne towards the arrival of a debt free LABOUR MONTHLY with that ten thousand circulation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBT FUND

	£	s.	d.
A. B. Thorne	100	0	0
J. Taylor, Mexboro'	0	2	0
Jean Brockley, Eastbourne	2	0	0
Anon., Prescott	1	0	0
Julius First, Johannesburg	1	0	0
F.W.B., Proceeds from Sales	0	7	9
J. McLanachan	0	5	6
Joan Findlay, Pretoria, South Africa	1	0	0
J. Taylor, Mexboro'	0	1	0
Arthur Boothby, New Mills	0	3	2
P. Neilson, M.P., Dunedin, New Zealand	0	3	0
Hastings, Surrey	0	2	0
Carried forward	£106	4	5

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	106	4	5
T.C.M.	0	2	6
Garment Workers' Union, Johannesburg, per E. S. Sachs, Gen. Secretary	4	0	0
Julian, Takapuna, New Zealand	0	10	0
F.W.B., Proceeds from Sales	0	7	6
Anon., Prescott	1	0	0
Henry Hanlin, Luton	0	5	0
T. P. Keating, Luton	0	7	6
Anon., Southampton	1	0	0
J.L., Buenos Aires	0	12	0
G.H.M., E.12	0	5	0
	£114	13	11

GUARANTEE FUND
(Monthly Guarantees)

	£	s.	d.
Anon., Prescott	1	0	0
A. Boothby	0	1	0
F. Bradley	0	0	10
Edinburgh Reader	0	0	6
"Doe"	0	2	6
A.E.G.H., London	0	10	0
C. Day Lewis	0	6	8
D.M., S. Rhodesia	0	4	0
R. J. Nicol	5	0	0
Onyx	0	10	0
Carried forward	£7	15	6

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	7	15	6
J. T. Pound	0	2	0
Tom Paine	0	1	0
B. Pickles	0	1	0
R.R.R., N.W.3	1	0	0
D.J.W.	0	10	0
B. A. Williams	0	2	6
X.Y.Z.	0	0	8
G.B.B.	0	2	6
	£9	15	2

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

**In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of*..... as a contribution to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

**I promise to send the sum of.....monthly to the Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose a first instalment of*.....

*Strike out whichever sentence does not apply.

Name.....

Address.....

Date.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every member of our staff has a personal interest in YOUR job.....

that is the effect of Co-partnership and naturally it reflects in the quality of the work.

Every man takes a personal pride in the job he is doing because it is the reputation of his House which is at stake and he knows that he will share the rewards of a job well done.

The staff of the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society is welded together by common interests as Shareholders of the Society. Social organisation and education create an atmosphere of contentment and unity in which the craftsman can give of his best.

That is why L.C.P.S. Print is finer and L.C.P.S. Service is better. You can easily prove it!

FINE PRINT BY EVERY PROCESS

Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Ltd.,

99 CHURCH GATE, LEICESTER. Telephone 58204

Branches at London and Kettering

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED